



CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

April — June 1961

LONDON
S · P · C · K

1961

*Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer,
Bishop of Exeter.

The Very Rev. E. S. Abbott,

Dean of Westminster

The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

SOURCES OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS IN MATTHEW
AND LUKE

F. W. Goodman

THE RELATION OF BAPTISM TO CONFIRMATION

J. Robinson

ST AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS AS RELIGIOUS TYPES

C. B. Armstrong

THE MODERN CHRIST

J. S. MacArthur

UNCTION IN THE SYRIAN BAPTISMAL RITE

E. C. Whitaker

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

E. L. Mascall

THOMAS ARNOLD

M. J. Jackson and J. Rogan

UNITING THE MINISTRIES

T. Donald Sully

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

- EDITH STEIN: *The Science of the Cross.* By C. S. Mann
- ELIZABETH WHITLEY: *Plain Mr Knox.* By Thomas M. Parker
- GORDON DONALDSON: *The Scottish Reformation.* By Eric Graham
- PAUL M. HARRISON: *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition.* By John Huxtable
- JOHN HARTLAND-SWANN: *An Analysis of Morals.* By I. T. Ramsey
- E. O. JAMES: *The Ancient Gods.* By D. W. Gundry
- REINHOLD NIEBUHR: *Nations and Empires: Recurring Patterns in the Political Order.* By F. W. Dillistone
- VIRGINIA CORWIN: *St Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch.* By the Editor
- H. TREVOR HUGHES: *The Piety of Jeremy Taylor.* By the Editor
- ROGER LLOYD: *The Borderland*; THOMAS TRAHERNE: *Centuries.* By Adam Fox
- JAMES CARPENTER: *Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought.* By Frederic Hood
- JOHN A. T. ROBINSON: *On being the Church in the World.* By Marcus Knight
- NOEL BONAVIA-HUNT: *Faith and the Mountain.* By Marcus Knight
- JONATHAN EDWARDS (ed. JOHN E. SMITH): *Religious Affections.* By F. W. Dillistone
- RICHARD M. FAGLEY: *The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility.* By Sherwin Bailey
- CONSTANTIN DE GRUNWALD: *Saints of Russia.* By R. M. French
- ERNST CHRISTIAN HELMREICH: *Religious Education in German Schools.* By L. B. Tirrell
- F. R. BARRY: *Asking the Right Questions: Church and Ministry.* By the Bishop of Whitby
- FREDERICK C. GILL: *The Glorious Company.* By Dewi Morgan
- FREDERIC GREEVES: *Theology and the Cure of Souls.* By G. J. Inglis
- J. TREVOR DAVIES: *Is Anyone There?* By George M. Bosworth
- KENNETH C. BARNES: *The Creative Imagination.* By the Bishop of Willesden

- ROBIN DENNISTON (ed.): *Part-time Priests?*
By the Bishop of Willesden
- PAUL AUVRAY, PIERRE POULAIN, and ALBERT BLAISE :
The Sacred Languages. By J. Robinson
- RONALD WALLS : *The One True Kirk.* By Oscar Hardman
- WAYNE E. OATES : *What Psychology Says about Religion;*
P. B. MEDAWAR : *The Future of Man;* JOSEF PIEPER :
Prudence. By R. S. Lee
- G. ERNEST WRIGHT : *An Introduction to Biblical*
Archaeology. By U. E. Simon
- LESLIE DAVISON (ed.): *The Christian Replies.* By Richard Tatlock
- GORDON HUELIN : *The Kingdom within you.* By Frederic Hood
- RUSSELL T. HITT : *Jungle Pilot.* By J. M. W. Adam
- PAUL TILlich (edited by ROBERT C. KIMBALL): *Theology*
of Culture. By C. T. Chapman
- B. C. BUTLER : *Why Christ.* By Richard Tatlock
- JOSEPH C. MCLELLAND : *The other Six Days;* CLAYTON
E. WILLIAMS : *The Dark Road to Triumph;* ALAN
WALKER : *A New Mind for a New Age.* By H. G. G. Herklots
- BO GIERTZ (tr. MAURICE MICHAEL): *With my own Eyes.*
By Susanna Hodson
- PAUL F. PALMER, S.J. (ed.): *Sources of Christian Theology.*
Vol. II: Sacraments and Forgiveness. By E. L. Mascall
- HERBERT KELLY, S.S.M. (edited by GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.):
No Pious Person. By George Branson
- R. E. HUME : *The World's Living Religions.* By D. W. Gundry
- J. G. DAVIES : *The Making of the Church.* By the Editor
- H. B. PORTER : *The Day of Light. The Biblical and Liturgical*
Meaning of Sunday. By E. C. Whitaker
- GEORGE H. TAVARD : *Protestantism.* By Frederic Hood
- JOSEPH MCCULLOCH : *The Essential Bible.* By J. F. D. Trimmingham
- R. GORDON MILBURN : *Significant Church History.*
By Gordon Huelin
- R. P. C. HANSON and R. H. FULLER : *The Church of Rome.*
A Dissuasive. By Oscar Hardman

- E. L. MASCALL: *Women and the Priesthood of the Church.*
By F. E. P. S. Langton
- RAYMOND G. COWHERD: *The Politics of English Dissent.*
By the Bishop of Southwark
- JOSE ORTEGA Y GASSET: *Man and People.* By Stephan Hopkinson
- ALBERT E. CAMPION (ed.): *Prayers for Christian Healing.*
By Norman Small
- E. C. HOSKYNs: *We are the Pharisees.* By George M. Bosworth
- W. E. SANGSTER: *Westminster Sermons, Vol. I;* MALDWYN
EDWARDS: *In the Midst of the Throne;* NELS FERRE:
Know your Faith. By H. G. G. Herklots

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- Mr F. W. GOODMAN is a Civil Servant and a student member of the Middle Temple.
- The Reverend J. ROBINSON is a Minor Canon of St Paul's.
- The Reverend Canon C. B. ARMSTRONG is a Canon Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral.
- The Reverend J. S. MACARTHUR, D.D., is Rector of Huntspill, Somerset.
- The Reverend E. C. WHITAKER is Vicar of Kirkby-Ireleth, Lancs.
- The Reverend E. L. MASCALL, D.D., is a Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, and a University Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion.
- The Reverend M. J. JACKSON and the Reverend J. ROGAN are members of the Sheffield Industrial Mission, of which Mr JACKSON is Senior Chaplain.
- The Venerable T. DONALD SULLY is Archdeacon of Lucknow and Secretary of the Negotiating Committee on Church Union in North India and Pakistan.

EDITORIAL

THE *Anglican*, which is the Australian equivalent of the *Church Times*, always pays considerable attention to our *Review*. In the course of a recent notice it was moved to give utterance to a *cri de coeur* which is likely to find an echo among the majority of our readers. The writer underlines the value of our book reviews. He also comments upon the fact that, since they generally outline the contents of each book concerned, it is possible for the reader to gain from them "something of an education in fields otherwise neglected".

He goes on to say how refreshing it is to find fifty or sixty new books of theological value reviewed each quarter. But then comes the tragic note: "despair sets in when one notices that these books would cost in Australia nearly £100". The high cost of books in Australia has long been a matter for comment. No doubt difference in the rate of exchange has something to do with it. Customs used to come in for a lot of the blame; but the revenue officials indignantly rebutted the charge. So far as one knows, it has never been possible for the average reader to pin down the precise cause of the trouble.

What can be done to meet it? The author is convinced that what the Church in his country needs is better stocked libraries. He points to the good work the Presbyterians are doing in that respect. He is even more anxious to impress upon his countrymen the example of U.S.A. There, he says, if a theological college is to obtain recognition it must be prepared to spend the equivalent of £4,000 a year on its library, "exclusive of equipment and janitorial maintenance". In England too universities and colleges have been spending much more lately on their library books. Indeed it has been quite necessary to do so in proportion as it has become more and more difficult for the students to buy the books for themselves.

Public libraries however can never take the place of a library of one's own. Books are friends, and one of the greatest joys of life is to live surrounded by one's friends. A book on one's shelves can always be referred to—in the midst of sermon-preparation, when writing the parish magazine, in the course of a discussion. A book in a public library is so far away that the point has probably been forgotten before ever it is verified. Even a lending library does not

satisfy the need, for the first reading is over and the book has been returned long before the need for occasional reference arises.

To build up his own library should be a cherished ambition of every priest. His shelves of books should grow up with him, fitting his developing needs like the skin of his body. With such a scheme he cannot start too early. The ghastly habit some men have of selling off their text books as soon as they have passed their last examination should be sternly denounced and as far as possible repressed by every Principal. Such men not only sell their friends, they sell the very tools of their trade. Those books they so lightly get rid of would have helped them not only to prepare sermons and lectures but also to keep mentally alert and to provide invigorating instruction for the intelligent members of their flock. What workman can work without his tools?

That brings us back to the question whether the parson can to-day build up a personal library if he wishes. The answer is surely Yes. The advent of the paper-back has made the acquisition of books possible for every man. The vast series of Penguins and Pelicans are a liberal education in themselves. Many books valuable for a clerical library are to be found in the Fontana and Seraph series. The University presses are reprinting many theological books of tried value. Oxford for instance has just issued Ropes' *Synoptic Gospels* with a new preface by Professor Nineham at 7s. 6d. More expensive paper-back reprints published in conjunction with America are Cochrane's *Christianity and Classical Culture* and Sohm's *Outlines of Church History*.

If our clerical friend wants new books rather than old, he need not despair, because some quite first-rate theological material is now making its debut in paper-back edition. There are the S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology and there are the *Scottish Journal of Theology* Occasional Papers. The Roman Catholic Church has even found it possible to give a permanent binding to first-hand theology at 8s. 6d. a volume in its extraordinarily good Faith and Fact Series.

In the midst of all the modern difficulty over obtaining theological literature one would have thought that far more of the clergy in every part of the Anglican Communion would have remembered and have had recourse to the good old Bray's Library. This was, and is, a wonderful system by which small bodies of clergy and laity can band together, receive grants towards the purchase of books, lend them round among the members for a

year, and then auction them off among themselves. How many of us belonging to the older generation look back with gratitude to Bray's and the opportunity it gave us both of borrowing and buying books. If there is any uncertainty as to the right way of starting a Bray's Library, application to S.P.C.K. would soon bring all the information required.

This does not exhaust all possible expedients. Friends and relatives can be tactfully reminded that book tokens make good presents for birthdays and Christmas. There may even be a few parochial church councils enlightened enough to see that the Rector is supplied with this most valuable part of his equipment. In Australia of all places, where the parish provides for office expenses and all sorts of running repairs to the car, an allowance for books might surely be added. No doubt it will be, as soon as the parishioners recognize that the rector's library is at least as important as his car.

SOURCES OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE

F. W. GOODMAN

THE METHOD that will be adopted in the present study is as follows. It will be assumed as a provisional hypothesis that the stories of both Matthew and Luke are substantially true. The two stories will be compared to see what apparent discrepancies there may be between them. An attempt will then be made to harmonize the two accounts. This will lead to the formulation of a theory to account for the divergences between the harmonized story and the extant narratives. The reader can then discard the initial hypothesis, compare the conclusion reached in this article with other theories of the sources of the two narratives, and form his own judgement of their relative merits.

This procedure is open to the objection that some features of Matthew's story are, it may be thought, so improbable that any theory based on the hypothesis that the story may be substantially true is condemned in advance. It is submitted, however, that these features are susceptible of explanation. The first difficulty is that the star of Bethlehem appears to behave like a guided missile rather than an astronomical phenomenon. This impression, however, is derived from carols and plays rather than from the Gospel narrative. According to the latter, the Magi, having seen the star in their own country, went to Jerusalem, presumably by the normal trade routes, were directed to Bethlehem, and then saw the star again: there is no suggestion that it had guided them throughout their journey. It is true that the narrative says that, when they saw the star on the road to Bethlehem, it went before them: a possible explanation is that, when they saw it, it was straight in front of them on a straight stretch of road, in which case, as they went forward, the star would have appeared to go before them; perhaps the star was obscured for a few minutes, during which they rounded a bend in the road, and after which it was seen to be over a house, away from the road; the Magi would then have made their way to the house, without necessarily looking any more at the star. Of course, any such explanation implies that the guidance of the Magi was planned for in the Divine ordering of the universe at the

creation; but if we believe in the Incarnation, this need not be considered incredible.

A second difficulty is that the massacre of the innocents is not mentioned outside the Gospel. It must be remembered, however, that Bethlehem was not a large town, and the number of victims would not have been very great. Herod's reign was so bloodstained that the murder of a few dozen children may not have attracted much attention. Similarly the lack of mention outside the Gospel of the visit of the Magi seems inconsistent with the statement that "all Jerusalem" was troubled (Matt. 2. 3). Perhaps "all Jerusalem" does not mean the population at large, but only the most important people, namely Herod and his counsellors, the high priest and other leading Sadducees, and the leading members of the Sanhedrin. Lastly, the narrative seems to imply that Bethlehem was at a considerable distance from Jerusalem, although the actual distance is only six miles. A possible explanation is that, when the Magi arrived at Jerusalem, they were told that Herod was at one of his other residences, and made their way to him there, and that this detail has dropped out of the story. Even if the reader does not find these explanations altogether convincing, it is hoped that he will be prepared to suspend his disbelief while he follows the rest of the argument.

If, then, we compare the two narratives, we find that, with one exception, they are complementary, i.e. they neither duplicate nor contradict each other. Although Matt. 1. 18-25 is parallel to Luke 1. 26-56 and 2. 1-20, the two accounts differ in that the former is written from Joseph's point of view, and the latter from Mary's. The stories of John the Baptist's birth and early life, of the shepherds, of our Lord's presentation in the temple at his mother's purification, and of his visit to the temple at the age of twelve are given by Luke but not by Matthew, while the story of the visit of the Magi, the massacre of the innocents and the flight into Egypt is given by Matthew but not by Luke.

There is, however, as suggested above, one apparent discrepancy between the two accounts. According to Luke, Nazareth was the original home of both Joseph and Mary, and they returned there, with the child Jesus, immediately after the Purification, and stayed there, except for annual visits to Jerusalem for the Passover. Matthew, on the other hand, appears to suppose that the original home of Joseph and Mary was Bethlehem, that they stayed there,

presumably in a house of their own, until their flight to Egypt after the visit of the Magi, and went to Nazareth for the first time after their return from Egypt.

The apparent contradiction can be explained by the hypothesis that, as Luke says, Nazareth was the original home of Joseph and Mary, and they went to Bethlehem for the census with the intention of returning to Nazareth afterwards, but that while in Bethlehem they found that there was an opening for a village carpenter there. They would have eagerly seized the opportunity, for it must have seemed to them that Bethlehem, with its Davidic associations and its proximity to Jerusalem, would provide a much better environment for the childhood of the Messiah than Nazareth, which apparently had a bad reputation (John 1. 46). Before finally settling down in Bethlehem, however, it would be necessary for them to return to Nazareth to wind up their affairs and take leave of their families. If, as is probable, Joseph was a widower with children whom he had left at Nazareth when he went to Bethlehem for the census, he evidently arranged for them to stay at Nazareth for the time being, possibly intending to send for them later. Thus, when the Magi came to Bethlehem, Joseph and Mary were there again in a house of their own, with the intention of remaining there. Luke would then be correct in saying that the Holy Family returned to Nazareth immediately after the Purification, and Matthew would also be correct in saying that they were in Bethlehem at a later date, and did not settle in Nazareth until, perhaps, some years afterwards. Even so, some explanation seems required of Luke's apparent belief that they settled in Nazareth immediately after the Purification, and of Matthew's ignorance of the fact that Nazareth was Joseph and Mary's original home. Similarly, with regard to several of the episodes peculiar to one or other of the evangelists, some explanation is required of how, if true, they can have been known to one of the evangelists but not to the other, or why, if both knew them, only one should have recorded them. The hypothesis that the later of the two evangelists was acquainted with the work of the earlier, and deliberately avoided repeating the work of his predecessor (a theory which is plausible in relation to John and the Synoptic Gospels) is unacceptable, because there is no such avoidance of parallelism in the rest of the two gospels.

These difficulties can, it is submitted, be resolved by the supposition that Matthew and Luke had for their sources different parts of the same manuscript. This is plausible on the hypothesis that the manuscript in question had been in the possession of a non-Christian, or bad Christian, whose only interest in it was to exploit it for his own financial advantage. In our own time it is quite common for Arabs who come into possession of ancient manuscripts (e.g. in the neighbourhood of Qumran) to divide them, in the probably correct belief that it will be more profitable to sell different parts to different purchasers than to sell the whole manuscript to one purchaser. There is, however, an important difference between these Arabs and the speculator who divided the manuscript with which we are now concerned. The Arabs in question are probably illiterate in their own language, and certainly incapable of reading the languages of the ancient manuscripts: their divisions of the manuscripts are therefore quite arbitrary. The divider of the source manuscript, on the other hand, could read the manuscript, and skilfully divided it in such a way that each of the purchasers may have supposed that he was acquiring substantially the whole story.

Before its division, the manuscript would have consisted of the narrative of Luke 1. 5–2. 39, then a short linking passage which disappeared in the division, followed by the substance of the second chapter of Matthew, and finally Luke 2. 40–52. The lost transition between Luke 2. 39 and Matt. 2. 1 may have consisted of no more than one line of manuscript: the source of the second half of Luke 2. 39 and the first half of Matt. 2. 1, with the lost link (which will be italicized) may have run something like this: “they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth; *whence, having sold their goods and kissed their kinsfolk, they came again unto Bethlehem of Judaea, where Jesus was born; and it was in the days of Herod the king.*” If this is so, the two fragments which passed to St Luke would have appeared to constitute the complete work, since there is no apparent break between Luke 2. 39 and 40; and Matthew (i.e. the author of the gospel which goes by that name) may likewise have supposed that he had the whole story except for the equivalent of Matt. 1. 18–25, for which, it is suggested, he had another source.

A *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the lost common source of the two infancy narratives is provided by the phrase “in

the days of Herod the king" (Matt. 2. 1, cf. Luke 1. 5: the occurrence of substantially the same phrase in both gospels confirms the supposition that they had a common source). "Herod the King" is not precisely equivalent to "King Herod": it contrasts the person referred to, not with other kings having different names, but with other Herods who were not kings. Now it appears from Acts 12. 1 that, after he had been given the title of king, Herod Agrippa I was known as Herod the King. The presumption, therefore, is that a document in which the term was applied without qualification to Herod the Great was written before Agrippa's proclamation as king in A.D. 37.

Now, of the Christians (not yet so called) existing at this early date, it is obvious that the one best qualified to give an account of the birth and early life of our Lord, and also of John the Baptist, was the Blessed Virgin Mary herself. There are several indications (one *a silentio*) that she was the author of the document under discussion. One is the use of the term "his father" for Joseph in Luke 2. 33, R.V. (the A.V., following the Greek *Textus Receptus*, has "Joseph", but it will hardly be disputed that the reading followed by the R.V. is the more likely to be original). If the doctrine of the virgin birth was accepted without question in the early Church—as, it is submitted, must have been the case, since its subsequent introduction would have led to a violent controversy, of which there is no evidence—St Mary is the one member of that Church to whom it would be natural to refer to Joseph as the father of Jesus. If authority is required for the assumption that she did so refer to him, it is to be found in Luke 2. 48. The same reasoning applies to the expression "his parents" in verses 41 and 43 (R.V.).

Another indication of authorship is the absence of allusion to Mary's ancestry. The virgin birth of Jesus and his descent from David are fully compatible with each other only on the assumption that Mary, like Joseph, was a descendant of David. Perhaps the fact that Jesus was ostensibly the son of Joseph would be considered sufficient to entitle him to be called a son of David, even if his mother was not of Davidic descent; but St Paul would surely not have described him as "made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*" (Rom. 1. 3) unless he believed either that Jesus was the son of Joseph, or that Mary was a descendant of David. As we have rejected the probability of the former hypothesis, we are left with

the latter. The silence concerning Mary's ancestry cannot be due to a prejudice on the writer's part against specifying the ancestry of women, since Elizabeth's Aaronic descent is mentioned (Luke 1. 5). It is submitted that the one person who, knowing that Mary was of Davidic descent, might well have omitted to mention the fact in an account of the birth of Jesus is Mary herself. Further indications of authorship are the references to Mary's mental reactions in Luke 2. 19 and 51, which, if not written by Mary herself, have not much point in the narrative as it stands.

Even more cogent is Mary's question in Luke 1. 34: "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Why did Mary not assume that the child promised to her was to be the son of Joseph? The answer must be in some circumstance not mentioned in the text. It is submitted that Mary herself is the one person who can plausibly be supposed to have recorded the question without perceiving that it called for explanation.

If the above reasoning is correct, the document cannot have been written with a view to publication. It must have been written for an individual, presumably by request. The individual would most probably be a woman, and it is suggested that the most likely woman to ask the Mother of Jesus for a written account of his birth and childhood, together with those of John the Baptist, would be Salome, the mother of James and John.

One would expect such an account to be written in Aramaic, the everyday language of the Jews of Palestine at the turn of the eras. The late Professor C. C. Torrey of Yale, however, in his essay "The Translations Made From the Aramaic Gospels"¹ gives reasons for holding that Luke 1. 5—2. 52 is translated from the Hebrew. This tends to confirm the hypothesis that the document was written by a woman, namely Mary. It was thought right to teach Jewish girls to read the Hebrew Scriptures, but apparently nothing else.² It would therefore be natural for a Jewess who had occasion to write something more ambitious than a private letter or business document to choose Hebrew rather than Aramaic as her medium, just as a Scotswoman whose only school book had been the English Bible would be likely to write in biblical English rather than in Scots. No doubt it was the exception rather than the rule for girls to be taught to read; but that Mary had a more emancipated upbringing than most girls of her time and country, or indeed of most times and most countries, is suggested by the implication in

Luke 1. 39 and 56 that she rode (or less probably walked) by herself from Nazareth to the Judaeian hill country and back.

It may be objected that the language and rhythm of the hymns in the first two chapters of St Luke's gospel show—so, at least, Torrey contends—that they were all the work of the same author—presumably the author of the context—which, it may be argued, is inconsistent with the supposition that the story is true and was written by a person who heard the original utterances (apart, of course, from the Magnificat, uttered by herself). The probability is, however, that after forty years Mary would remember the substance, but not the actual wording, of the various utterances, so that her account of those utterances would be moulded by her own modes of expression.

Another possible objection is that Mary cannot have known what happened to the Magi after they left her. Apart, however, from the possibility of correspondence (perhaps rather remote in the circumstances) the probability is that, after their return to their own country, the Magi would relate their story to pupils and friends, omitting details that might lead to the premature identification of the Child. The story may have eventually reached the court of Herod the Tetrarch, and been passed on to Mary by Joanna, the wife of the tetrarch's steward (Luke 8. 3, 24. 10). Incidentally, parts of the story told by the Magi, after numerous repetitions, may have been attached to various sages and heroes, including Buddha and Mithras: the common assumption that stories related both of our Lord and of earlier historical or legendary characters must have been transferred from the latter to the former, even when the earliest records are within the Christian era, is not necessarily correct.

The use made by Matthew and Luke of the portions of Mary's narrative that came into their possession differed. (Presumably neither of them knew the authorship of the document, though both felt confidence in its reliability.) Matthew adapted the material to his own scheme and style. St Luke, on the other hand, did not, it is submitted, incorporate it in his gospel at all. While accepting Streeter's arguments in *The Four Gospels* (1924) for holding that the third chapter of St Luke's gospel originally came immediately after the prologue, I question his contention that Luke 1. 5—2. 52 is a later insertion by the evangelist. It is submitted that St Luke, being a literary artist, would, if he had made the insertion, have also

made at least one consequential alteration, namely to transfer the genealogy from its present position in the third chapter to an appropriate place in one of the first two chapters (following the reference to Joseph's descent in either 1. 27 or 2. 4). It would therefore appear that the gospel as delivered to the "most excellent Theophilus" did not include Luke 1. 5—2. 52.

My suggestion is that St Luke did not acquire his portion of Mary's narrative until after he had completed his gospel and sent it to Theophilus. When he did acquire and read it, he thought it would be of interest to Theophilus and, no doubt, even more to his wife (Domitilla, if we accept the plausible identification of Theophilus with Domitian's kinsman Flavius Clemens). He therefore translated the narrative and sent the translation to them. It was kept along with the manuscript of St Luke's gospel; and when, in due course, it was decided to copy the gospel for publication, the Birth and Infancy narrative was incorporated with it. I would suggest that the reference to Quirinius (Luke 2. 2) was inserted as a gloss by an early copyist, perhaps the first: as it appears to confuse two different censuses, it can hardly have formed part of the original narrative; and it is not much more likely to be due to St Luke, who appears to have been unusually careful in such references. Perhaps Theophilus himself made the gloss.

Only a cursory mention has so far been made of Matt. 1. 18-25. Whatever its immediate source, this passage, if factually true, must have been derived from information supplied by either Joseph or Mary. Although it is not impossible that Joseph left a memorandum which was utilized, it is perhaps more probable that he did not. The passage is more likely to have been derived by oral transmission from Mary, who, of course, would have known Joseph's side of the story as well as her own. Our conclusion, therefore, is that the two gospels do not provide independent, still less conflicting, accounts of the birth and early life of our Lord, but the two accounts are both derived from the reminiscences of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

¹ A contribution to the *Studies in the History of Religions, Presented to C. H. Toy by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*, New York, 1912.

² See *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, articles Education and Woman, Rights of.

THE RELATION OF BAPTISM TO CONFIRMATION *

J. ROBINSON

I EMBARK upon this paper very conscious that I am setting out on waters which are both troubled and dark. The various churches differ sharply on the question of whether or not confirmation is necessary and among those who do maintain its necessity there is great variety of custom and usage. Yet all claim to be following, and not infrequently, following exclusively the New Testament. Nor is it possible for me, as it might be on some other subjects, to expound simply and dogmatically the Anglican view, refuting and confounding all others, because Anglican theologians themselves have held and still do hold widely differing views on this subject. All I can do therefore is to offer you my own thoughts and my own reading of the New Testament evidence. They have no authority other than my own and I can only offer them as the views of one who is an enthusiastic Anglican and as views which would receive some support from at least some other Anglicans.

The question at issue is briefly, what in the New Testament is the method of entry into the Christian Church; what in fact makes a man or woman a Christian? The answer seems on the face of it to be both simple and uncomplicated—it is baptism. Our Lord after his Resurrection commanded his apostles plainly, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28. 19), and if doubts are expressed about the authenticity of these verses because of the Trinitarian formula, the apostolic preaching in the early chapters of Acts gives clear evidence of the undisputed place of baptism as the universal, necessary, initiatory rite for membership of the Christian community (Acts 2. 38). But what exactly is implied by this word baptism? What specifically baptism means in the New Testament, what ceremonies and rites it involves is left tantalizingly obscure. The fact is that all this was so well known, so matter of fact, to the first Christians that no explanation and certainly no description was felt to be necessary. All we possess are almost casual references which offer little indication of what

* A paper read at a Conference of Anglican and French Reformed Church Theologians at Lambeth Palace, September 1960.

actually was the content of baptism. St Paul expounds at length its doctrinal significance but that is not a great deal of help in dealing with this particular problem. We possess no description of the rite of baptism as practised by the Church in the New Testament period. Surely this is the prime cause for the great differences which exist between the various Christian bodies to-day.

Our first aim must be to discover, as far as we may, what exactly βάπτισμα means in the New Testament. I used the Greek βάπτισμα and not the English, baptism, deliberately because the first thing we must guard against is investing the New Testament βάπτισμα with the associations, the doctrines, and the rituals which are inevitably associated in our minds with "baptism". Anglicans for example, must not invest βάπτισμα with the associations of either the 1662 or 1928 prayer books, according to the predilections of the individual, or with the heady enthusiasms of the Liturgical Movement. We must come to scripture for exegesis not for eisegesis.

Nor must we place too great an importance on philology. Explaining something in terms of its roots alone can often come near to explaining it away. Βάπτισμα we all know is derived ultimately from the verb βάπτω, I dip. But we should, I feel sure, deceive ourselves if we felt that this was conclusive evidence that βάπτισμα meant and could only mean a dipping in water. All those who have written of recent years on the subject seem to be agreed that βάπτισμα in the New Testament is a new word for a new thing. For example, "The word "baptisma" is a new word for a new thing—the great new reality of baptism into Christ's body."¹ Equally we must not interpret βάπτισμα in terms of some similar practice among other religious groups, whether the adherents of the mystery religions, the sectarians of Qumran, or the common, contemporary Jewish practice as indicated by Rabbinic tradition. Baptism other than Christian seems to be, by and large, baptism *from* something, from the defilement whether ritual or ethical of the world, while Christian baptism is baptism *into* something or rather, into someone, namely into Christ. The Rabbinic teaching that by baptism the proselyte was reborn and became a child seems to be the nearest approximation to Christian baptism. This is what one would expect since recent scholarship has indicated how heavily the New Testament in general and St Paul in particular, leans on Rabbinic usages and ways of thought. In understanding what βάπτισμα means I think we shall find much

help in the Rabbinic traditions, but that tradition is illustrative and not definitive. βάπτισμα is a new word for a new thing.

There is one source of help which I have not yet mentioned, which ought to be most fruitful and is certain to be the most disputed, and that is the tradition of the early Church as we find it clearly described and defined from A.D. 200 onwards. It seems to me that from that time the arguments with heretics and unbelievers were so fierce, the appeal to Apostolic Tradition as a guarantee of true doctrine and practice so firm and conclusive, that what was accepted then without dispute, can be taken as coming directly without significant change from the New Testament period. One of those undisputed things was that to become a Christian, a person must profess faith in Christ and repentance for sin and be baptized in water and receive the laying on of hands. These were the two parts of one initiation rite which was performed rarely (twice yearly at Easter and Pentecost) and the officiant in all but exceptional circumstances was a bishop. It seems to me that this gives us the best clue to the meaning of βάπτισμα in the New Testament, namely that the word stands for the Christian initiation rite which included immersion in water and the laying on of hands and was with few exceptions administered by an apostle. Surely Paul's distinction in the first chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians between the work of an apostle and baptizing is the overstatement of an outraged polemicist.

It has been frequently noticed that specific reference to the laying on of hands as a part of Christian initiation is exceptional rather than normal in the New Testament. This is so, but it by no means implies that the practice was rare but rather that it was so commonplace as to be taken for granted. Twice in Acts is the laying on of hands mentioned in this context and on each occasion there seems to be a special reason for it. In Acts 8 we are told of baptism being administered at Samaria by Philip, who was not an apostle. Therefore particular mention is made of the coming of the apostles Peter and John who administer the laying on of hands. This is perhaps the more especially noted to demonstrate the difference between the power of the Spirit and the power of magicians such as Simon. Admittedly there follows the story of Philip's baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch which is not followed by any apostolic laying on of hands, but it would have been physically impossible for the apostles to follow and find the eunuch and there is too the far

larger question of the regularity of Philip's baptism. Such indiscriminate baptism without any possibility of incorporation into the worshipping community seems to be out of keeping with the rest of the New Testament. And why should Philip baptize? After all he had been ordained with the other six deacons to administer the affairs of the Church for the sole purpose of leaving the apostles free for more directly spiritual work. This baptism can therefore be hardly taken as an example of normal New Testament practice. Perhaps Philip is acting as a kind of *diaconus vagans* whose activities were even a source of concern to the apostles.

It has also been objected that there is no reference to any laying on of hands in the baptism of our Lord. Dr Daube in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* has pointed out that in Jewish proselyte baptism the decisive moment in the ceremony was always looked upon as that when the candidate stepped up from the water. The verb for this is *'alah*, to go up, which at this period is used with the various meanings; to enter the promised land, to go to Jerusalem from a foreign country, and to rise from the grave; all of which meanings are reflected in the teaching on the significance of baptism. He further pointed out that in the oldest gospel, Mark, and in the gospel nearest to Judaism, Matthew, it is particularly noted that Jesus came up out of the water and it is just at that point that the Spirit descends and the *Bath Qol* is heard. This surely is the equivalent of the divine laying on of hands, the commissioning and empowering for that unique Messiahship which was the purpose of the Incarnation. Notice how in St Matthew the very next verse tells of Jesus being led up *by the Spirit* into the wilderness for the Temptation where the methods and implications of the Messiahship were more fully worked out.

It is also argued that there is no mention of Jesus ever laying on hands in the sense of confirmation or ordination, but only in blessing. However Dr Daube has shown that the Greek verb ἐπιτίθημι, always used in the New Testament in the phrase laying on of hands, is used indiscriminately for three Hebrew verbs, *shith*, *sim*, and *samack*, the last of which has a very different meaning and usage from the other two. The first two are used of laying on hands in the sense of touching in blessing or in healing, the third verb *samack* means, to lean on, and its use is reserved to the sacrificial cult and the ordination of a rabbi, in both instances the meaning being, the pouring out of one personality upon another

and the making of the other person into one's substitute. Hence we should never expect Jesus to use the laying on of hands in the sense of *samack* because his personality was unique. It could not be transferred or handed over. With the apostles however, the case is quite different. We find in their practice an increased use of laying on of hands in the sense of *samack* and we should expect it because the handing over of their spirit-filled personalities and the creation of substitutes is essential for the fulfilment of their purpose.

It seems therefore entirely in keeping with all the evidence to claim that βάπτισμα in the New Testament is the word which describes the rite of Christian initiation, a rite which was normally celebrated by an apostle and included both water baptism and the laying on of hands. What was its meaning? Although the symbolism of water ensures that the idea of renunciation and cleansing can never be lost or ignored, the dominant emphasis is baptism into the Messiah. This is clearly shown by the baptism of our Lord himself and the direct relationship which he himself saw between it and his Messiahship and crucifixion. "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how I am constrained until it is accomplished." (Luke 12. 50.) And the question to James and John, "Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?" (Mark 10. 38.) It is in the dying of Jesus that the world is renounced and also, according to St John at least, that the Spirit is given. The Christian in baptism and confirmation, to use modern terminology, is brought to the cross of Christ and himself accepts in faith the Messiahship of Christ (he dies with Christ), with all that that means in personal renunciation; and is himself accepted by God in and for the sake of the Messiah (he is raised with Christ).

There has been much discussion, by Anglicans at least, of the precise significance of water baptism and the laying on of hands especially with reference to the giving of the Spirit. Some have argued that the Spirit is fully given in water baptism and the laying on of hands is but a re-inforcement of the original gift. Others, notably Canon Mason and more recently Dom Gregory Dix, have argued that water baptism is merely a cleansing rite subordinate to and preparatory for the more important laying on of hands when the Spirit is for the first time given. Dix has argued that as Jewish initiation had two parts, water baptism and circumcision, so Christian initiation has two parts, water baptism and the

laying on of hands, and in each case the latter rite is the more important and definitive one. It seems to me that Dix is here placing far too much emphasis on the parallels between the rites. He is making Jewish practice definitive for Christian practice and not merely illustrative of the background against which Christian initiation must be viewed. Moreover, were not many converts to Christianity women to whom the analogy would not apply? In fact the whole discussion as to the precise point within Christian initiation when the Spirit is given seems to me to be an importation into the subject of such Western analytical reasoning as is not present in the biblical thought. In the New Testament, water baptism and the laying on of hands are both complementary parts of one whole. The Spirit is given in each of them and the answer to the problem of the relationship between them lies in the interaction and interrelationship between the corporate and individual aspects of personality which is so characteristic of Semitic modes of thought and so prominent in the Old Testament. For instance, in the baptism of our Lord, he passes through Jordan, he enters the promised land, the kingdom where the Spirit is outpoured on all flesh and yet as he ascends out of the water, the Spirit descends upon him to declare and empower him for his personal vocation of Messiahship. So the Christian in the waters of baptism dies with Christ, rises into the realm of the Spirit and through the laying on of the hands of the apostolic man has the apostolic personality poured into him that he or she may truly imitate Christ in the whole of life and both find and fulfil that vocation which is uniquely his or hers. Confirmation is indeed the ordination of the laity. Baptism and confirmation are complementary. They both bring the recipient within the realm of the Spirit but while water baptism means incorporation into the Messiah and into the Israel, the people of God, which in the Messiah had contracted into one man, the individual Christian still needs for the full realization of and effective empowering for his personal vocation and discipleship that contact with the apostolic man, that "leaning on" to infuse the personality of Christ, which is his or her guarantee of an individual, unique, personal place in the kingdom of the Messiah.

¹ A. Richardson, *Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, p. 339.

ST AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS AS RELIGIOUS TYPES

C. B. ARMSTRONG

THE CONTROVERSY between Augustine and Pelagius, unlike many other battles of orthodoxy against heresy, is still a live issue, because it is a conflict between two enduring religious attitudes which was incapable of settlement by any conciliar formula, since the adversaries were not fighting intellectually on a common field. Hence assertion is met by counter-assertion and not by refutation, and Augustine's victory was won as much by questionable statecraft and power politics as by argument; while the defeat of Pelagius was due more to his friends and enemies than to theological errors.

A survey of the characters of the protagonists and of the course of their struggle will justify this. Pelagius is known to have been at Rome in 405; it seems probable that he came there considerably earlier from Britain. Whether his origin was from England, Ireland, Scotland, or Wales is a subject of controversy: he is called a monk, but in the days when monasticism was only gaining a footing in the West this did not necessarily involve attachment to any monastic group: Pope Zosimus indeed refers to him as "laicus". His personal character is admitted even by his enemies to have been exemplary: Augustine calls him "vir ille tam egregie Christianus" and speaks of him as "zelo ardentissimo accensum". The purity and austerity of his life were pre-eminent: perhaps his consciousness of virtue, as so often, was responsible for a lack of humility: yet, as one determined in his adherence to the example of Christ, he was deeply conscious of the sinfulness of pride. His firm conviction of the rectitude of his opinions and of his way of life, never faltered. He had acquired a good education, and writes in a more polished style than Augustine. We find him quoting Juvenal, Virgil, and Sallust but there is no evidence of more than a superficial knowledge of the Latin classics, though they gave his writing clarity and eloquence. The influence on him of ecclesiastical writers is more profound—particularly that of Cyprian and Ambrose. Through Ambrose, Origen, and Lactantius he had a fair superficial knowledge of Greek philosophy, though it was not Ambrose's neoplatonism and mysticism, or Origen's speculation that appealed to him. His

biblical knowledge was profound. For Cyprian he had much admiration: he praises his eloquent language, happy explanation, and strong persuasion. But Cyprian's high doctrine of the Church and sacraments did not appeal. His moral earnestness as to following the precepts and example of Christ, and his exactitude in Scriptural exposition attracted Pelagius: "Yet he cannot please," he writes, "further than in words, those who do not know the mysteries understood by the faithful." From Tertullian he is deterred by his "small polish and obscurity". He knew Origen, possibly from the translations made by Rufinus and Jerome, but rather as a commentator than as a theologian.

But above all it was in the gentle and eloquent sanity of Lactantius that he found his inspiration. Here, in spite of a defective theology, Pelagius found an exposition of Christianity suited to his own taste and temper. The emphasis of the "Institutes" on moral earnestness, on the importance of human effort for righteousness, on the example rather than the atonement of Christ, and on spiritual rather than sacramental worship suited Pelagius' rational humanism. He agreed with Lactantius that we do not sin of necessity but from purpose and will: and with his view of divine grace as *assistance* given to man by God "ab extra", and not by the infusion of a mysterious power.

In general, then, one might say that Pelagius' interpretation of the faith followed a rational tradition such as was set by second-century apologists like Aristides, Athenagoras, and Minucius Felix. The mystical trend inherited from Plotinus through Ambrose did not appeal to him; nor was he attracted by Cyprian's ecclesiasticism or the growing sacramentalism of his age. His affinity was rather with Stoic rationalism and moralism, but he is carried beyond Stoicism by moral fervour and deep piety, and he delighted, as much as any Academic, in the cut and thrust of argument and, as much as any commentator, in textual interpretation. He was in fact a devout Christian in the Classical and humanistic tradition: and in this respect (though not in his extreme asceticism) he may well be typical of the Christianity of many educated Anglican laymen of to-day, who hold firmly to the faith mainly on moral lines, who delight in the spiritual benefits of simple worship, and ignore the mysteries of theology, the intensities of sacramentalism, and the heights and depths of mysticism as things intended for the clergy and religious orders. His religion was in the main sane and

extravert. It was inseparably associated with virtuous living and spiritual worship. His age was one in which large numbers of pagans were coming over to Christianity for reasons which could scarcely be described as conversion. Mass baptisms were common, prefaced by a bare confession of faith: magical ideas of sacramental grace were prevalent, partly derived from Syrian and Egyptian religions, especially the mysteries: there was, as Sir Samuel Dill says, "a vast mass of interested and perfunctory conformity to the religion which had become established". There were many sham converts: absolution was easily given, and, to quote the same writer: "The line between Christian and pagan was long wavering and uncertain." It is not surprising that the effect on some devout Christians was a reaction to stern asceticism and renunciation of the world. We read of great Roman ladies like Paula and Laeta falling under the spell of Jerome's stern counsels of perfection: Paulinus of Nola, gentle and charitable though he was, writes to a young soldier (Ep. 25) that if he would follow Christ he must renounce his profession, his riches, his family life, and all secular interests. Pelagius himself in his letter to Demetriades, a lady of high birth, who, on the eve of her marriage, renounced the world and took a vow of virginity, is almost equally uncompromising. In his letter to Celantia and his commentary on Corinthians the severity of his standards exceeds that of St Paul.

At Rome the rigours of his life and doctrine, and his moral fervour, so rare in those unsettled and luxurious times, attracted a circle of admirers among the educated and cultured. Members of the great *Gens Anicia* were his patrons. Young students, *auditoriales scholastici*, like Caelestius, Sextus, and Julianus made much of him. Though he formed no community, de Plinval suggests that he headed a kind of movement, which was spread rapidly by an almost missionary zeal. Such then were the circumstances and character of Pelagius at the time when the clash with Augustine began in A.D 405. Let us now look at his adversary.

The life of Augustine is so well known that it would be otiose to retell it. Outwardly it had been that of a young professor of rhetoric from Africa who, under the influence of Ambrose, had embraced Christianity in 387, been ordained priest four years later in 391 and bishop in 395, owing his rapid promotion to his eminent piety and scholarship. In 405, as Bishop of Hippo, he was deeply immersed in the repercussions of the Donatist controversy. For

there remained in Africa a church of the uncompromised, who considered that they alone were pure, and uncontaminated by the leniency of Catholics to those who had lapsed from the faith in Diocletian's persecution. This led Augustine to develop a high doctrine of sacramental grace, particularly in Baptism, the Eucharist, and Ordination, maintaining against the Donatists that they did not owe their efficacy to the sanctity of the minister. He had not therefore much concern for, or knowledge of, what was going on at Rome, when Pelagius began to be influential.

His life story had not been so much a tale of events, as an inward history of mental and spiritual struggle. And it was this struggle that determined his theology. Brought up by a pious mother in the rigour of the North African Church which, touched by Carthaginian Semitism, was not averse from reinforcing its doctrine by sanctions of eternal and massive punishment, Augustine emerged in young manhood, recklessly, into the libertinism of a corrupt society against a strong consciousness of the sinfulness of his ways. The Confessions reveal also a hypersensitiveness to minor faults which are coupled with graver sins with a curious lack of proportion. His abiding temptation was to sensuality, and the mental strain of his lapses was increased by high ideals of chastity. In this respect there seems to have been a certain tension between his mother and his father, which did not help. At this time, aged between seventeen and nineteen, he fell under the influence of Manichaeian ideas: "for almost nine years", he says, "I wallowed in that pit". Augustine knew well in himself the conflict of the powers of light and darkness. In mind he assented to their asceticism, and their repudiation of the material as evil: but the conviction was without relief from sacramental religion which they despised. When he moved to Rome and practised as a rhetor, he plunged into wide, discursive, reading, seeking ever for a rational faith which might bring his discordant life into harmony. He had been impressed by Manichaeian pretensions to esoteric knowledge, particularly that derived from astrology; but when one of their leaders, Faustus, visited Rome, Augustine found him to be a charlatan; disillusioned, he reacted towards the scepticism of the Academics, not without the hope that he might find beneath it an inner kernel of Platonic truth. Then a chance came of an appointment at Milan, which was gladly taken, and the influence of its

saintly Bishop Ambrose became increasingly dominant. He describes himself at this period as in a doubtful state of faith. He had not utterly cast off Manichaeian ideas, because as he says, he could not conceive a spiritual substance, which would have refuted the doctrine of matter as evil; from this search no doubt there developed his later doctrine of quasi-substantial Grace. For a time, though now instructed and half persuaded, he "delayed to turn to the Lord", as he says, "bound with the disease of the flesh and its deadly sweetness". "Me for the most part", he confesses, "the habit of satisfying an insatiable appetite tormented, while it held me captive." How far the sensitiveness of Augustine's conscience exaggerated his profligacy is difficult to estimate. Such self-humiliation is not uncommon in introvert natures like, for example, Kierkegaard's. But it cannot be doubted that his strong sexual instincts continually thwarted his genuine longing for holiness, and that his mental pilgrimage, until his conversion, was a vain search for integration.

At this Milanese period he abandoned many former errors, though they died hard, and began to find a truer guide in St Paul, though as yet he could not accept the divinity of Jesus Christ and the doctrine of the Word made flesh. How was it, he wondered, that his irresolution shrank from the example of the monks, from the decision made by so many simple converts, and the experiences of certain of his friends? Conviction of the full truth of Christian beliefs, which he finally reached, found his will still unable to make a decision. "I was at strife with myself", he says, "and rent asunder by myself." How the tension within this "soul-sick and tormented man" was resolved by his sudden conversion is well known. "Instantly", he says, "a light of serenity was infused into my heart and all the darkness of doubt vanished."

The elements of Augustine's inner and spiritual pilgrimage were the determinants of his theology. He had failed to find God by reason. Why? Right reasoning must be impossible for a corrupted soul. His will had been irresolute and incapable of decision. Why? Because the will can only be moved to righteousness by God's Grace. Unaided it is in bondage to sin. He had been a slave to concupiscence. Why? it must be inseparable from human nature. Why inseparable? Because humanity itself is corrupted by the Fall. He had failed utterly in his own strength. Why? Because God alone takes the initiative in those whom he wills to save. He had fallen to

Manichaeism, because he had failed to realize the power of the Spirit over matter in the Sacraments. He had fought a single-handed battle and been defeated. Why? Because "nulla salus extra ecclesiam", the city of God. He had relied on his own powers, and such pride had almost been his ruin. Gladly at last he resigned himself to divine determinism and "grace abounding". Henceforth he sees all things mystically in God. In de Plinval's words: "He lives in an ambience penetrated by divine action, which is grace."

Such were the protagonists in the great controversy, two men both deeply religious, but the one with a religion of God as the true life of the soul within, and the other of God as Lord of all the earth, and of humanity, the acme of his creation. Augustine introvert: Pelagius extravert. An existentialist mystic against a humanistic moral and rational worshipper. Both saints: but contending from different planes, the inner and spiritual as against the outer and social. Both adept in reasoning, but unable to come together because their premisses were incompatible. The freedom of which Augustine writes is a psychological feeling, while that of Pelagius is a real power of self-determination.

This being so, the course of the controversy is determined by party manoeuvres far more than by Augustine's fifteen books against Pelagius and the numerous replies by Pelagius himself, Caelestius, and Julian of Eclanum. Pelagius and Caelestius retired from Rome to Africa before the threat of Alaric's invasion about 408. At this time Augustine was occupied with the suppression of the Donatists, and although he had some knowledge of the spread of Pelagian opinions at Rome he was not awake to the extent of their errors. Pelagius soon passed on to Palestine; but he left Caelestius at Carthage, and his pupil's incredible loquacity (as Mercator calls it) and love of controversy quickly compromised his master. Provocatively Caelestius sought ordination, but since his views were well known, he was challenged and accused of heresy before a council summoned by the Bishop Aurelius. Here he promulgated the stock Pelagian theses, namely that Adam would have died anyhow whether he had sinned or not, that his sin affected only himself, and others merely by his bad example, that infants were born innocent, that there were sinless men before Christ, and that the law, as well as the Gospel, leads to the Kingdom of God. Caelestius was condemned and retired to Sicily. Augustine was not at the council but later saw and approved the proceedings.

From Sicily Caelestius went to Ephesus where he secured ordination, and subsequently returned to Rome via Constantinople. Meanwhile Pelagius had had a reasonably good reception in Palestine from John the Bishop of Jerusalem. But there was trouble in store. Orosius a young Spanish priest arrived at Hippo, Augustine's see, and seized his chance of an important mission by persuading Augustine that Pelagius must not be allowed to spread his corruption in the East, Augustine sent him on an inquisition to Palestine with a commendation to Jerome. Jerome at Bethlehem had become suspicious of Pelagius, who not only had criticized his methods of translation, but also seemed to him, quite falsely, to be reviving the stoic doctrine of Apathy, and the errors of Origen. Orosius stirred up strife, telling of the condemnation of Caelestius and accusing Pelagius of the same heresies. Bishop John held a council. Pelagius defended himself ably, denying the authority of Augustine and an African council, and was acquitted.

Jerome and Orosius reacted by violent pamphlets, and were aided by the arrival of two new opponents of Pelagius from Gaul, Heros and Lazarus, bishops driven from their sees by the Pelagian majority there. Jointly they persuaded the Bishop of Caesarea to summon Pelagius before another council at Diospolis, in December 415. There is no possibility of acquitting Pelagius of evasion and some concealment of his views, before this council: he was again acquitted of heresy, and the acquittal was notified to Pope Innocent. The African Church was furious, and so was Augustine. Two councils hastily summoned sent urgent remonstrances to the Pope, and Innocent, pleased by their unusual deference to his see, excommunicated Pelagius and Celestius. "*Causa finita est*", wrote Augustine, "*utinam aliquando finiatur error.*" But it was not finished. Innocent died in March 417 and his successor Zosimus received the decision of Diospolis together with strong protests and confessions of Catholic faith from Pelagius and Caelestius. Caelestius made a good impression before an inquiry, and Zosimus told the African bishops that they had been too hasty, and, conceiving that their action was an intrigue, absolved the Pelagian leaders.

The African Church was up in arms. A council at once remonstrated with the Pope telling him that he had judged persons, and not principles. Many influential churchmen in Italy were canvassed, and the Emperor Honorius himself was invoked. Supporters of

Pelagius, in reply became violent, and Honorius intervened against them. Zosimus weakly gave way, and an imperial rescript banished the leading Pelagians. A further Council of Carthage in May 418 passed a systematic refutation of their tenets in nine articles.

Church and state were now united against them: and they were driven underground. Eighteen bishops refused to desert Pelagius and were deprived of their sees. But when Zosimus died in December 418, Julian of Eclanum and Caelestius published further manifestos and demanded a new council. Julian declares that the Pelagians are defending the "five glories"—Creation, Marriage, Free Will, Law, and the Saints. But Pope Boniface (418-22) and the Emperor Honorius and Augustine were now too strong for them. The persecution was intensified. The next Pope Celestin proved equally hostile, and most of the leaders fled. An attempt to rally their forces was made at Constantinople under the young Emperor Theodosius. But hopes of restoration by the Council of Ephesus in 431 proved futile, since the heresy of Nestorius occupied the field, and the Pelagian case was neglected, and involved in Nestorius' condemnation. After this council Caelestius disappears. Pelagius, still convinced of his orthodoxy, and earnestly desiring reconciliation had found refuge, after the Tractoria of Zosimus (418), in Palestine. But only for a time. A synod at Antioch excluded him from the holy places at Jerusalem. Heart-broken he retired to Egypt where he still had friends, and spent his remaining years according to tradition in writing commentaries on Job and the Song of Songs, and one more book on the virtue of Constancy. He was well qualified to write it.

The Pelagian controversy raised and still raises the gravest issues. Two devout Christians of high intellectual ability, acknowledging the same documents as basic and confessing the same Creed, reach almost diametrically opposite conclusions on matters of the greatest importance. And why? I do not suppose that the answer has ever become clear until our own day when continental philosophy has clarified the difference between human life at the existential level and at the normal intellectual and social level on which most people try to conduct their lives, and most churchmen to construct their objective theology. Augustine, with reasons of the heart, was working from an existential consciousness of God, and Pelagius, reasoning from revealed truth, was drawing intellectually its full consequences. Both nobly lived their convictions: but Augustine

penetrated to a deeper level, and, speaking generally, carried the Church with him.

An analysis of some of the main differences will make this clear. Pelagius argued for the real freedom of our wills to make right choices. He postulated the justice of God, and the fact that both the law and the gospels give moral commandments and promise rewards for obedience and penalties for disobedience. This involves that we are morally responsible, which we cannot be, without the power to do right or wrong. Our wills therefore must be free: Freedom, like our life, is the gift of the Creator. But knowing our liability to sin, and the difficulty of Christ's command that we should be perfect, God gave further grace to assist us "ab extra". He gave the law and the example of holy men, and above all the example of the perfect life of Jesus Christ. Since even this was not enough he gave a promise of forgiveness of sins to those who turn to Christ in penitence and faith: and, even beyond this he provided that meritorious living should be met by further gifts of grace by which perseverance in well doing should be encouraged.

This rational moralism was stern in its demands: the ascetic's rule of poverty, chastity, and obedience should be incumbent on all thorough Christians. Renunciation of the world and severe self-discipline was demanded, and followed, for example, in the seventh century by Columba and his monks, as also by St Aidan. It made a much needed protest against the easy acceptance into the Church of masses of pagans by a formal baptism, under imperial pressure, against salvation by sacramental rites without moral amendment, and against the worldliness and riches of many of the Italian clergy. Though perhaps lacking in humility, it is an appeal to honour, a call to manly following of our great leader, such as still is often echoed in sermons to young men and boys, and echoed effectively. But it has grave defects: the first is that of the Stoic wise man, who rarely, if ever, existed. Few indeed could carry Pelagius' precepts into practice. To live ethically by reason has not been found easy by many who have tried to do so; and when the ethical standard is the Dominical precepts some stronger motive power than a determined will is necessary. Secondly, self-originated righteousness too easily becomes self-righteousness and pride, and, even if successful, results in an aggressive puritanism. Thirdly, like Stoicism, it ignores the emotions and particularly the prime Christian motive, love. Again, from the Christian view-point, it

minimizes the Atonement, "Evacuatum est scandalum Crucis", Augustine says, and tends to make Christ our example rather than our Saviour. And yet again it takes little account of the inward and spiritual situation of human souls and makes of religion little more than an intensification of the Roman *religio*.

Against all this Augustine sets his doctrine of divine grace. It sprang from his personal experience. He had tried earnestly to find a philosophy which could integrate his life, and failed both intellectually to discover it, and morally to abjure his sins. The long struggle against his passions had been unsuccessful; and his reasonings had brought no conviction. Then, as he believed, God had acted, acted simply of his grace for an undeserving sinner. His will had been powerless until it was moved by a greater power. St Paul's situation had been his. "The evil that I would not that I do: the good that I would I do not . . . wretched man that I am who will deliver me from the body of this death?" "Quis me liberabit". "That great sad thought", de Plinval finely says, "was fastened on Christianity by Augustinianism till the renaissance. Christian liberty, affirmed by Irenaeus and even Cyprian, was forgotten. The joy of the adoption of sons vanished . . . the Church detached itself from the eclecticism of Ambrose and the Greek fathers to adopt the rigour of Tertullian and Cyprian. Lutheranism and Jansenism were in germ in Augustine's interpretation of St Paul." So too was Calvinism. For indeed the old Manichaeian doctrines continued to influence Augustine long after he had abjured them, as Julian of Eclanum was to affirm. We may recall the judicious Gibbon's comment "I am informed that . . . the orthodoxy of St. Augustine was derived from the Manichaeian school . . . The Church of Rome has canonised Augustine and reprobated Calvin. Yet the real difference between them is invisible even to a theological microscope."

"Quis me liberabit?" The answer was found by Augustine in the Old Latin and Vulgate text of Romans: "Gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum." Rarely has the peril of "little Greek" like Augustine's been more clearly demonstrated. The words are a mistranslation of Rom. 7. 25, χάρις τῷ Θεῷ, "thanks be to God". Grace to Augustine became the gracious power of God acting on human souls. Therefore irresistible; therefore indispensable! His own experience of conversion had shown him an irresolute and impotent will suddenly empowered to full faith and

salvation. Why and how, God alone knew. In the light of this conception of grace the efficacy of the sacraments was explained, and the necessity of the Church as the sphere of Grace, the "*civitas Dei*," illuminated. If grace is entirely the gift of God, it is exercised as he wills, inscrutably. Pauline phrases, not unqualified elsewhere, seemed to confirm this determinism. Such as, "therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9. 18), and "So then it is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy". Augustine reasoned as acutely, more acutely, than his adversary, from his own premisses. He felt himself saved by an irresistible power proceeding from the divine love and taking possession of his soul. In his new allegiance and service of God he felt himself free, free by the "*beata necessitas non peccandi*". Freedom became to him a psychological feeling of unimpeded power to do God's will. It was the gift of God, and within the soul. It had nothing to do with the power to make our own choices and to do as we will. We have no freedom, he thought, in Pelagius' sense, because we are either bound by sin, or determined by God: and it is God's affair whom he will elect to salvation. Does that make God unjust? How can we dare to define what God's justice should be? It is enough for us to know his love and mercy. Pelagius argued that there are three elements in a willed act, *posse*, *velle*, and *esse*. The fact that we *can* will to do right or wrong is the Creator's act, part of his grace. The willing and acting are in our power. Will for Pelagius acts in a context of nature. But will for Augustine is determined by divine grace and given power to act by divine grace: freedom is but the sense of acting in that power. Many phrases in our collects re-echo Augustine. "O God, for as much as without thee we are not able to please thee." "Without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy." "Whose Service is perfect freedom." "O God who seest that we have no power of ourselves to help ourselves." One could quote prayers and hymns almost indefinitely and they seem to show that Augustine touched bottom in sounding the depths of the Christian soul.

Why then had his will been impotent? Augustine, reasoning perhaps too narrowly from his own experience, had one answer—concupiscence. To Pelagius chastity like other virtues was obligatory because it was commanded. To Augustine sexual desire or lust in general was inseparable from human nature because, wrong as

it was, it seemed the very means by which the race was propagated. The two facts, that it was part of our nature and yet sinful, presented a dilemma. For humanity was God's creation which he had seen as good. The story of the fall of man, an inspired ontological myth explaining man's proneness to sin and error, was seen historically by Augustine as providing the explanation he needed. Coupling it with a traducian view of all souls as part of one human soul-stuff created by God, he saw in Adam's sin an original *vitium* transmitted to all his descendants by reproduction. Hence his doctrine of original sin, for which he must bear the responsibility. Even St Paul does not use the terms "fall" or "original sin": he does not imply that Adam's descendants are implicated by birth: and says nothing of the mode of transmission of the consequences of Adam's sin.

The doctrine to-day is only held in a form greatly modified by philosophical considerations, except by Barth and the Neo-Calvinists who still hold that human nature is totally corrupt. Augustine drew from it four consequences which have tarnished the fair fame of his truer insights. Firstly that those whom God does not move by his grace, are left, it seems by his will, in the "massa perditionis". Of the men of Tyre and Sidon he writes: "It was not given them to believe, and therefore the means of believing was denied them." Pelagius, holding with the Stoics that "assent is in our power" for the same reason, moral responsibility, defines the grace of God as the possibility of not sinning given us when our nature was established, i.e., our free will aided by the divine law and Christ's example.

Secondly, Augustine concluded that the corruption of our nature by original sin includes corruption of the mind, so that without faith we cannot see truly. Our minds must first be illumined by grace. Here Augustine is clearly speaking of the existential situation of the Godless soul, so graphically described by Sartre and Heidegger. Pelagius sees reason on the problematical and impersonal level, on which personal convictions seem to have little bearing. It may be that Augustine was basing his view on Christ's saying, "He that doeth the will, shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." But its extension by Barth to a corruption of all human reasoning, or, at least, all philosophical theology, as valueless, seems to be Augustinian in origin.

Thirdly, Augustine from his doctrine of original sin drew his conclusion that children are born in sin and cannot be saved except by baptism. It was an argument from the sacrament of Baptism to the human condition, i.e., "The Church administers infant Baptism. Baptism is for remission of sins. Therefore infants must be corrupted by sin." They have not consciously sinned (though Augustine says to Julian that they are not so innocent as he thinks) but they are all infected by birth with original sin: their sins "*aliena sunt sed paterna sunt*". Augustine is arguing from a traducian view of the soul, and Pelagius believing that children are born in a state of innocence, though liable to sin, takes a creationist view. Both views are obsolete if soul is not thought of as a separate and divinely infused substance but as personality. Yet it cannot be denied that infants are born with sinful tendencies into a sinful world, and nowadays original sin is taken in this sense.

The crux leads to Augustine's fourth false emphasis, his view of marriage. Marriage, as Battenhouse says, plays a large part in the controversial corpus because it provides Augustine with the most telling proof of the impotence of the will and its hereditary transmission. The chief end of marriage according to his, and the Roman, doctrine, is procreation; divorce and birth control are inadmissible, and continence is the ideal. Now the will to have children is not enough alone, without the aid of sexual desire, or in Augustine's word, of concupiscence. Concupiscence or sexual desire is a natural and transmitted instinct. It is sinful for Augustine, and the impotence of the will without its aid seems to him a proof that only by the help of Grace can natural concupiscence, or, if you like, original sin, be overcome. He extended the narrow sense of concupiscence to cover the vitiation of human nature by transmitted desire. His view of marriage is not exalted, especially for an ordinance approved by God, as Pelagius was quick to point out. It is, as the 1662 prayer book says in a phrase altered in 1928, "for a remedy against sin". "The weakness of incontinence", Augustine says, "is hindered from falling into the ruin of profligacy by the honourable estate of matrimony". Pelagius thought that all this was a libel on human nature, and a blasphemy against a divine ordinance. But he himself was equally convinced that virginity, though not commanded, was a higher state than conjugal chastity. Licentiousness was of course a sin. But the difference between the two was that Pelagius thought that sexual desires could be

controlled or repressed by a firm will, as he seemed to have proved to himself, while Augustine from *his* experience, found that it could not. Their psychological experiences differed, and who shall venture to say which was right.

The errors of Pelagius being mainly theological rather than psychological, did not excite antipathy to the same degree. Moral responsibility does seem to involve freedom of the will, but as Augustine showed the fact that we can will freely would not involve ability to carry out what we will. For Pelagius nature moves by a necessity imposed by the Creator, but free will is an exception within a universal necessity, given by Grace to man alone. In this he was Stoic. But he did not ask the further question as to how a free will can carry out its intentions in a determined world. And he did not realize either that will is not arbitrary, but determined by motives. In a determinist world will not the motives themselves be determined? Augustine said they are, and therefore postulated supernatural Grace as a more powerful motive, determining the will to good actions, in which alone it would feel free, because it would be acting in accordance with God's omnipotent will.

Again Pelagius relied too much on divine rewards and punishments. The fear of hell and the hope of heaven played too large a part in his moralism. The latter, it appears, and not the quality of virtue in itself, was the real incentive to the ascetic life. Again, the intervention of Christ does not mean to him, as it does to most Christians, a real atonement. Christ saves more by his example than by his atoning death. True, Pelagius admits that God gives, for his sake, the grace of forgiveness of sins. But this is not intrinsically connected with the Cross: rather it is for the sake of the merit won by his son. God, being just, is enabled to forgive sins by the equipoise of Christ's self-sacrifice, but we must deserve that forgiveness by our own merits.

Again, there was the crux of *impeccantia*: a man, by his own good will, could be sinless. This seemed, perhaps rightly, to Augustine to be scandalous, especially as it was supported by dubious instances of Old Testament Saints. Anyone who has thought himself capable of moral perfection, is either soon undeceived, or soon the victim of pride. It is true that *impeccantia* to Pelagius did not mean perfection so much as a persistent effort of the will for more and more progress in righteousness. But as Augustine saw, even such perseverance was not within human competence. And

finally the Pelagian Christian fights his moral battle more or less on his own, without the corporate strength of the Church or reliance on efficacious sacramental aid. Pelagius relied on his own moral strength and his own reasoning: in creed he was Christian but at heart a Stoic, yet a Stoic with a transcendent and not an immanent Deity.

The conflict between the inner and the outer in religion is perennial, and only occasionally becomes explicit. By a strange reversal Augustine's religion of inward and spiritual grace became organic and institutionalized in the medieval Church to a degree which caused the explosion of a new revolt of inwardness at the Reformation. Augustine is thus the prime mover of Calvinism and of Catholic institutionalism. He constructed and disrupted the *Civitas Dei*.

Can there be a solution of the opposition? A compromise perhaps, such as John Cassian and Vincent of Lerins attempted? But semi-pelagianism was not a solution: it only discarded the most glaring of Augustine's extravagances, total depravity, irresistible grace, and absolute predestination. Perhaps we should know to-day that a solution may be impossible. For our own lives are lived on two levels. The existential, secret, solitary, dark unless illuminated by faith in the presence and power and love of God: and the social on which we move among our fellows by law, custom, convention, and reason, in the sphere of culture and civilization, where faith in God's just and merciful governance provides a centre of stability and sanity. Pelagian in our intercourse with man, and Augustinian on our knees before God? Perhaps we are intended to be so: perhaps the duality of our human situation demands a compromise which is neither hypocrisy nor schizophrenia.

THE MODERN CHRIST

J. S. MACARTHUR

“JESUS CHRIST is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever.” If that is true what motives have been operative in the various Christologies that have taken shape during these nineteen centuries of Christendom? Have they all been deformations of the faith committed to the saints? If we compare the earliest deviations from the Christological orthodoxy which later took shape in the Chalcedonian Definition with those of to-day they will appear to be diametrically opposed. The early deviations were mostly docetic, that is, they recognized the divinity of our Lord, but failed to do justice to his humanity. The Incarnation was no real incarnation, but only a theophany in which the human form was unreal. To-day the divergence is usually in the opposite direction of a reduced or humanitarian Christology, which fully recognizes the real humanity of Jesus Christ but comes far short of Nicene and Chalcedonian orthodoxy as regards his deity.

Yet real and important though the differences between these two types of Christology may be there are elements in them that render them much more closely akin than superficially they appear to be. In each case the adherents of the divergent Christology would claim that they arrive at it by a more rational and unfettered approach to the data than orthodoxy permits. The Gnostics of the early days who sponsored the docetic Christologies proclaimed this by the very name that they assumed. They were the intellectuals who had gone a little further into things than the simple believers. But the kind of knowledge at their disposal was not the fruit of profound philosophical speculation or severe mental discipline: it was rather catalogue knowledge, the sort of thing that will satisfy the intellectually curious rather than the intellectually disciplined. To describe the Gnostics as the first theologians of the Church is indeed to flatter them.

It might perhaps be unkind to compare the Liberal Protestant theologians of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the Gnostics, yet it may be questioned whether their divergence from orthodoxy is any more due to a freer and more rational treatment of the scriptural data. In both cases the divergence is due to an approach to the data conditioned by a set of preconceived ideas into which the scriptural data had to be fitted. The docetists

approached the data with one set of ideas, the Liberal Protestants with another; hence their divergence from orthodoxy in different directions. But the parallel between Gnosticism and modern humanitarian Christology is particularly instructive for those who challenge this reduced Christology. They will remember that the real answer to Gnosticism came, not from the "orthodoxasts" who simply stood firm on the tradition of the Church and discouraged speculation, but from the Christian thinkers who challenged the intellectual claims of Gnosticism, demonstrating that its speculative framework was philosophically unsatisfactory.

On the whole British theology has kept its head more successfully than continental in these matters, with less violent swinging of the pendulum from extreme Liberalism to the Barthian flight from reason. In particular it owes much to the *Lux Mundi* school of thought. That school of thought, and notably Bishop Gore, came in for a good deal of adverse criticism for their alleged inconsistency in accepting freely the results of Old Testament criticism while refusing to go much of the way with the more radical New Testament criticism because of their refusal to face the drastic doctrinal revision that its acceptance would have involved. But the inconsistency is more apparent than real. The *Lux Mundi* school were perhaps not explicit enough in clarifying their reasons for acceptance of the Old Testament criticism and reserve regarding the conclusions of the more radical New Testament critics, but they seem to have felt instinctively that whereas the Old Testament criticism was based largely on a more rational approach to the Old Testament data, much of the New Testament radicalism was determined less by a more careful sifting of the New Testament evidence than by a philosophical approach to it that they could not accept.

Yet the general statement that whereas the earliest Christological deviations were docetic the modern ones tend towards a reduced or humanitarian Christology needs qualification. It is not our concern here to examine the evidence for humanitarian Christology in the early days, but it may be worth while to point out that docetism is not dead. The Christology of Theosophy and of Christian Science is quite definitely docetic, and Theosophy has marked and acknowledged affinities with ancient Gnosticism, especially in its pseudo-intellectualism and mythologizing. Both these aberrations may be regarded as curiosities hardly worthy of the theologian's

attention, but they make a wide appeal, and the parish priest cannot afford to neglect them, remembering that though history does not repeat itself it can and often does imitate itself. Incidentally it may be noted that the Christology of Jehovah's Witnesses is Arian.

But can there be such a thing as legitimate Christological development? The Chalcedonian Definition itself would appear to give an affirmative answer to that question, for the terms and even the thought forms of the Definition are not biblical, though the Church has accepted the Definition as true to the biblical data. Yet it cannot be denied that Greek thought has contributed to the formulation of the Definition. That was inevitable; but for Greek thought the pre-eminent characteristic of deity was immortality, and immortality tended to be negatively conceived, so that whatever could be predicated of mortal man was *ipso facto* not to be predicated of deity. Hence the difficulty of the two natures in one person and the string of negatives in the Definition. It has been suggested that if the Church had taken more account of the theomorphic anthropology of the Old Testament with its insistence on man's being made in the image of God some of the difficulties might have been less acute. We think of Dr Oswald Dykes' famous criticism of the Definition when he wrote: "A Being who combines in an inscrutable fashion Divine with human properties, and of whom consequently contradictory assertions can be made, whose single Person is Divine, while his dual natures hold an undefined relation to one another: this is not a scheme to satisfy head or heart. It is but the bare skeleton of a dogma, in which one cannot readily recognize either the Jesus of the Gospels or the Christ of the Church's worship."¹

Archbishop William Temple was scarcely less severe when he described the Definition as revealing the bankruptcy of Greek Patristic theology, though he later retracted this criticism. Dr Oliver Quick was wiser when he said that the two-nature doctrine as defined at Chalcedon is just a form or necessary mould for Christology, and that it is a permanent and necessary form up to a point, since the union, interpenetration, and distinctness of God-head and manhood are the irreducible elements in the Christian experience itself, and cannot be absent from any religion which legitimately claims the Christian name, and that it is really the content put into the mould that will determine the value of the Definition.²

This raises the question whether in the centuries that have passed since 451 there has been any advance in the knowledge of the nature of God and the nature of man that may be relevant to the Christological problem. The negatives of the Definition provide a framework consistent with the biblical revelation, and in spite of all criticism of the Definition the Church may well doubt whether that framework can be abandoned without danger to the faith. It may be possible, however, that growing knowledge may supply the means of filling out that framework just as in the early centuries it supplied the means for constructing it.

Nevertheless not all ways of conceiving the natures of God and man and their relation to each other are consistent with the Bible view of life, and it may well be that some of these fashions of thought have had too much influence on Christological theory. Take, for example, Hegelian idealism, which exercised so strong an influence throughout the nineteenth century and the earlier years of the twentieth. From the Christian point of view it was an improvement on the deism of the eighteenth century, but many believe that it gave a wrong turn to Christological thought from which it is only now beginning to right itself. In its most radical form it produced the Christ-myth theory of Arthur Drews, according to which Christianity originated in the mind of St Paul, with some help from the mystery religions. The figure of Jesus Christ was a projection of St Paul's mind. This is an astonishing abuse of the argument from silence, St Paul's silence regarding the incarnate life of Christ being interpreted as indicating the mythical character of that life. Such extreme views never gained wide acceptance, yet Hegelian influence is traceable in much less extreme Christological teaching. It was characterized by a strong belief in immanent progress, reinforced as the century went on by what were regarded as deductions but were in reality analogies derived from Darwinian theories of organic evolution. What kind of Christology were such basic concepts likely to produce? In a world that was gradually growing better and better by its own momentum what room was left for salvation, redemption, atonement, judgement? If the operation of God was restricted to the evolutionary process, how was the Incarnation to be fitted into that?

Here we have the clue to the reduced or humanitarian Christology characteristic of nineteenth-century Liberal Protestantism,

namely, that it was not the result of a more unfettered examination of the New Testament data, but originated in unwillingness to abandon the immanent-progress-evolutionist frame of reference, and we suggest that the abandonment of that frame of reference does not involve the flight from reason that Liberal Protestantism feared.

The motive of Liberal Protestantism that we have suggested was not of course made explicit. The line taken was something like this.³ Liberal Protestants asked themselves what was the relation between the life of Jesus of Nazareth and the Christ of St Paul, of St John, and of Catholic piety. Their answer was roughly this, that the life of Jesus of Nazareth provided the basis for an ethical humanitarianism which became a mystery religion in contact with Oriental-Greek cults, with this important difference, that for Christianity immortality was morally conditioned to an extent not found elsewhere. Liberal Protestantism did its best to get back to the Jesus of history, whose features were to be found in the Synoptic Gospels. The Christ of St Paul and of the Fourth Gospel was not regarded as historic. Ostensibly this was because the Christology of St Paul and of the Fourth Gospel, which emphasized the divinity of Christ, did not agree with that of the Synoptists, but we suggest that the real reason was that it did not conform to the philosophical presuppositions with which Liberal Protestantism approached the Christological problem. Such a suggestion is not easy to justify directly, but here is what looks like a confirmation of it. Even in the Synoptists Liberal Protestantism found a good deal that was not consistent with their reduced Christology. Instead of attributing this difficulty to the arbitrary mould into which they were trying to fit the Synoptic data they attributed it to the intrusion of Paulinism into the Synoptic tradition.

Similarly with the Fourth Gospel. Not many outside the Church of Rome would maintain that the Christian faith stands or falls with the Johannine authorship of it, but what are the arguments against Johannine authorship? Ostensibly the discrepancy with the Synoptic tradition, e.g., the Baptist as witness and not merely forerunner, the absence of the parables, our Lord's own much more definite teaching of his consubstantiality with the Father, the different chronology of the Passion. These discrepancies are not without importance, but they are only the façade covering the real motive of the argument, which is that the admission of such a

document as primitive and proceeding from an eyewitness would make the Jesus of history a very different figure from the Jesus of Liberal Protestantism. But if the beloved disciple was the first to realize the significance of the empty tomb, which escaped the notice of St Peter, whose association with the Marcan tradition should not be forgotten, it seems probable that he had a deeper understanding of the earlier experiences of discipleship that he had shared with St Peter and the rest.

Liberal Protestantism believed that by freeing the Jesus of history from Catholic accretions it was safeguarding the faith of the future. Modernism, which cannot be too carefully distinguished from Liberal Protestantism, took a different line. It welcomed the broadening of the basis of Christianity through the preservation and purifying, not only of its Old Testament heritage, but also of the mythology and worship of countless generations of Gentiles. Was not that precisely the "spoiling of the Egyptians" commended by St Augustine? But Modernism is a plant, perhaps a weed, that can grow only in Roman soil, and even there the weedkillers of authority have dealt with it pretty drastically. No part of the Anglican communion has yet been sufficiently Romanized to produce it, but in so orthodox a work as Bishop Chandler's *The Cult of the Passing Moment* we can find refusal to be alarmed by the possibility that the mystery religions as well as the Old Testament tradition may have made their contribution to Christian theology.

Hoskyns' own view is that in the Synoptic tradition the idea of the Kingdom of God is central, and that the significance of this phrase is presumed to be intelligible only to those who believe in Jesus as the Christ; and yet when St Peter declares his belief our Lord substitutes the obscure title Son of Man.⁴ He observes that Christology underlies the idea of the Kingdom, the title Son of Man underlies the Christology, and eschatology underlies the whole. He concludes that this complexity is to be sought rather in the life and teaching of Jesus than in the various strata of the Synoptic tradition. He also considers that it is not necessary to assume that what can be easily paralleled from human experience is historical, and that what is supernatural has been superimposed by later credulity. Nevertheless he makes this interesting proviso, that an experience that is felt to be supernatural tends to be expressed symbolically, and the symbolical language or actions are capable of

being misinterpreted as literal fact without, however, the symbolism being thereby obscured. A case in point would be the unfruitful fig tree and the cursing of the fig tree followed by its destruction.⁵ His conclusion is that the experience of salvation through Christ—justification by faith rather than ethical humanitarianism—may well have been the essence of Christianity from the beginning. "Not only [he says] may the supernatural element have been primitive and original, but also that exclusiveness, which is so obviously a characteristic of Catholic Christianity, may have its origin in the teaching of Jesus rather than in the theology of St Paul."⁶

A new turn was given to Christological discussion by the publication early in the present century of Albert Schweitzer's Christological survey, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Liberal Protestantism was there subjected to a very searching criticism, though hardly in the interests of a return to traditional views, which was how many who knew Schweitzer only at second hand interpreted it. Schweitzer emphasized the eschatological element in our Lord's teaching which Liberal Protestantism had tried to soft-pedal, attributing it to his followers, saturated as they were with the Apocalyptic teaching of late Judaism. But the difficulty was that if the belief of the early Church that the end of all things was imminent was derived from the teaching of Christ then he himself must have been mistaken, and that difficulty Schweitzer does not deal with in a way that is easily intelligible. In the concluding chapter of his book he says that the historical foundation of Christianity as built up by rationalism, by Liberalism, and by modern theology no longer exists; but that does not mean that Christianity has lost its historical foundation. The work which historical theology thought itself bound to carry out, and which fell to pieces just as it was nearing completion, was only the brick facing of the real immovable historical foundation which is independent of any historical confirmation or justification. Jesus, he says, means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from him and flows through our time also. This fact can neither be shaken nor confirmed by any historical discovery. It is the solid foundation of Christianity. It is not Jesus as historically known, but Jesus as spiritually arisen within men who is significant for our time and can help it. Not the historical Jesus, but the spirit which goes forth from him and in the spirits of men

strives for new influence and rule, is that which overcomes the world.

This teaching is indeed hard to grasp. Schweitzer's own dedicated life shows that for him at least it has significance and power, but how can a Christ who is not rooted in history and who cannot be found in the New Testament fail to be at the mercy of the vagaries of contemporary speculation? Here is Schweitzer's solution:

But in reality that which is eternal in the words of Jesus is due to the very fact that they are based on an eschatological world-view, and contain the expression of a mind for which the contemporary world with its historical and social circumstances no longer had any existence. They are appropriate, therefore, to any world, for in every world they raise the man who dares to meet their challenge, and does not turn and twist them into meaninglessness, above his world and his time, making him inwardly free, so that he is fitted to be, in his own world and in his own time, a simple channel of the power of Jesus.⁷

Christology is the doctrine of the person of Christ, but the concept of personality was not part of the equipment of ancient philosophy. The concept took shape in the Trinitarian controversies of the early Church. But what began as a theological concept has in the intervening centuries been handled with other than theological motives. Psychology in particular has made much of it. Has psychology made any contribution to the concept of personality that is relevant to the doctrine of the person of Christ?

Dr William Sanday thought that it had. He believed that the theory of the subliminal consciousness sponsored by F. W. H. Myers and taken up by William James was highly relevant to mystical experience in general and Christology in particular. If it is through uprushes of the subliminal consciousness that man knows his greatest moments of creative activity and awareness of divine indwelling, was it not possible that the divinity of our Lord resided in his subliminal consciousness? Here is what Sanday says:

Now it seems to me that the analogy of our human selves can at least to this extent be transferred to the Incarnate Christ. If whatever we have of divine must needs pass through a strictly human medium, the same law would hold good even for Him. *A priori* we should expect that it would be so; and *a posteriori* we find that as a matter of fact it was so. We have seen what difficulties are involved

in the attempt to draw as it were a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, and to say that certain actions of His fall on one side of this line and certain actions on the other. But these difficulties disappear if, instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine. This line is inevitably drawn in the region of the subconscious. That which was divine in Christ was not nakedly exposed to the public gaze; neither was it so entirely withdrawn from outward view as to be wholly sunk and submerged in the darkness of the unconscious; but there was a sort of Jacob's ladder by which the divine forces stored up below found an outlet, as it were, to the upper air and the common theatre in which the life of mankind is enacted.⁸

This theory of Sanday's might have established itself more firmly than it did had not the investigation of the subconscious, or perhaps more accurately the unconscious, taken a turn that might have surprised both Myers and James. For in the Freudian psychology the unconscious became the storehouse of all that was most disreputable in man, that part of him in which the causes of his maladjustments and failures were to be sought. How inappropriate to seek there for the locus of the divine nature of Christ!

So it seemed at least, and for a time Sanday's theory was forgotten; but recently it has received favourable consideration from Dr W. R. Matthews in his *Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century*. He believes that the hypothesis which Sanday, prematurely, but surely with foresight, tried to weave into his new Christology has turned out to be more far-reaching than Sanday himself could have conceived. Dr Matthews very justly points out that the setting aside of Sanday's theory because of the new turn that Freud gave to the psychology of the unconscious is not wholly reasonable, for the facts which the Freudian psychology revealed do not annul the facts which a study of poetic and artistic inspiration suggests. Myers had already recognized the two aspects of the unconscious when he said that it was both a rubbish heap and a gold mine.

Also Freud's theory of the unconscious is not the only one. There is Jung's which postulates not only an individual unconscious but a

racial one, which interpenetrates the individual unconscious, and from which arise symbols carrying with them some part of the past experience of humanity. If this theory of the racial unconscious is true it may have some very important Christological implications. Note, for example, how both in the New Testament and in traditional theology the person and work of Christ are represented as having racial significance. Perhaps our normal way of thinking about humanity is too individualistic, so that our separateness may be true only on the level of consciousness, while, below that level, we are linked together, and such a phrase as "in Adam all die" gains a new meaning.

The phenomena of telepathy and extra-sensory perception offer another line of investigation. Here again it would appear that below the level of consciousness there is a linking of selves such that thoughts, emotions, and even memories can pass from one mind to another without conscious communication, thus providing empirical confirmation of Jung's theory. Does this throw any light on the Fourth Gospel dictum that Christ "knew what was in man"? Or on the atonement? We recall those well-known lines of Myers himself, applied to St Paul, but perhaps even more applicable to St Paul's Master:

Then as I weary me and long and languish
 Nowise availing from that pain to part,—
 Desperate tides of the whole great world's anguish
 Forced thro' the channels of a single heart.

Do the theories of personality here outlined involve the postulation of a unitary subject of all experience? That would imperil the uniqueness of the Incarnation, to mention but one difficulty, and Dr Matthews prefers a pluralistic conception of the metaphysical basis of personality, according to which there are many subjects which transcend our time and space; yet the ultimate subject in each person is not timeless but created. The Incarnation then, he says, would be the taking of a created subject by the divine Logos and the intimate union with it so that the human subject, while never ceasing to be human and created, was so intimately joined with the divine Logos that they formed, in the sphere of history, one person.

- 1 *Expository Times*, October, 1905, p. 10.
- 2 *Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition*, p. 101.
- 3 Cf. Sir Edwin Hoskyns in *Essays Catholic and Critical*.
- 4 Mark 8. 29-32.
- 5 Luke 13. 6-9; Mark 11. 12-21.
- 6 *Essays Catholic and Critical*, pp. 168f.
- 7 *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 400.
- 8 *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, pp. 165f.

UNCTION IN THE SYRIAN BAPTISMAL RITE

E. C. WHITAKER

DOM R. H. CONNOLLY, in his edition of the liturgical homilies of Narsai, draws attention to the early Syrian rite of Christian initiation, of which the peculiarity is that it has only one administration of oil or chrism, and that before the baptismal washing. Later writers¹ have given the opinion that this pre-baptismal unction is to be understood as confirmation. In the following pages the view is put forward that the unction in question ought probably to be understood as an exorcism: although such a view will most probably involve us in the conclusion that the early Syrian Church had no rite of confirmation.

Leaving on one side the various Greek and Syriac documents adduced by Connolly and others,² which briefly indicate the existence and use of a rite of this type, we turn to the more substantial references, from which we may get some indication of its meaning. The first of these must be the twenty-second Homily of Narsai. Narsai was a theologian who taught at Edessa for about twenty years before the year 457, and then for many years in Nisibis. He wrote in Syriac, and his twenty-second Homily includes a lengthy passage about the unction before baptism. The homily attests the use of prayer for the blessing of the oil, which includes an invocation of the Trinity: it is to the power of the names hidden in the oil that Narsai attributes its efficacy. It attests also the signing of the Cross, in oil, upon the candidate's forehead, with the words "N. is signed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost", and subsequently the anointing of the whole body. According to T. Thompson³ it is clear from the language of Narsai "that this pre-baptismal unction is really the unction of confirmation". To the mind of the present writer this is very far from clear. It is true that Narsai makes two references to the Holy Spirit in his account of the unction. At one point, speaking of the power of the oil, he says that it receives its power from the Holy Spirit: but the power of which he speaks is plainly an apotropaic power, "that hostile demons and vexing passions may not harm him". In the same vein, Narsai also says:

The Spirit gives power to the unction of the feeble oil, and it waxes firm by the operation that is administered in it. By its firmness it makes firm the body and the faculties of the soul, and they go forth confidently to make war against the evil one. The sign of his names the devils see upon a man, and they recoil.

The other reference to the Spirit is contained in the following passage:

As a drug-shop he (the priest) has opened the door of the holy temple: and he tends the sicknesses and binds up the diseases of his fellow-servants. With the external sign he touches the hidden diseases that are within: and then he lays on the drug of the Spirit with the symbol of water.

The last words of this passage clearly connect the gift of the Spirit with the baptismal washing: but the mention of the "external sign" is a reference to the unction, and Narsai clearly regards it, in this instance, as therapeutic. Elsewhere in the same paragraph he emphasizes the therapeutic effect of the oil. He says:

The office of a physician he exercises towards the members, touching the exterior and causing sensation to reach to the hidden parts. To the body and soul he applies the remedies of his art, and the open and hidden disease he heals by the divine power.

These quotations from a lengthy and diffuse homily are set out in the belief that they provide a fair and accurate summary of what Narsai believed about the unction before baptism. It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the ceremony was invested with an apotropaic and therapeutic purpose, that it was designed to turn away the powers of evil and to promote healing: in fact, that it had precisely the two properties which we associate with exorcism.

The Acts of Judas Thomas was written before the middle of the third century, most probably in Edessa, and its original language was most probably Syriac. The Syriac text has been edited and translated by W. Wright⁴: and the Greek version is edited by Lipsius and Bonnet⁵ and translated by M. R. James.⁶ The divergences between the Greek and Syriac texts are sufficient to require that we make use of translations from both texts in the following study.

The two descriptions of baptism which concern us here are the baptisms, first of Mygdonia, and secondly of Iuzanes (Syriac:

Vizan) and two women. Both accounts provide prayers which are described by R. M. Woolley⁷ as "actual forms for the blessing of the oil before the pre-baptismal exorcism". Such are the words with which Woolley describes prayers made over the oil before its use in the pre-baptismal unction. The text of the prayers is as follows:

At the baptism of Mygdonia, Greek text.

Thou holy oil given unto us for sanctification, secret mystery whereby the cross was shown unto us, thou art the straightener of the crooked ilms, thou art the humbler (softener) of hard things (works), thou art it that showeth the hidden treasures, thou art the sprout of goodness; let thy power come, let it be established upon thy servant Mygdonia: and heal thou her by this freedom.⁸

At the baptism of Mygdonia, Syriac text.

"Holy oil, which was given to us for unction, and hidden mystery of the cross, which is seen through it—Thou, the straightener of crooked limbs, Thou, our Lord Jesus, life and health and remission of sins,—let thy power come and abide upon this oil, and let thy holiness dwell in it."

And he cast it upon the head of Mygdonia and said, "Heal her of her old wounds, and wash away from her her sores, and strengthen her weakness".⁹

At the baptism of Iuzanes, Greek text.

"Fruit more beautiful than all other fruits, unto which none other whatsoever may be compared: altogether merciful: fervent with the force of the word: power of the tree which men putting upon them overcome their adversaries: crowner of the conquerors: help (symbol) and joy of the sick: that didst announce unto men their salvation, that showest light to them that are in darkness; whose leaf is bitter, but in thy most sweet fruit thou art fair; that art rough to the sight but soft to the taste; seeming to be weak, but in the greatness of thy strength able to bear the power that holdeth all things". Having thus said [a corrupt word follows]: "Jesu: let his victorious might come and be established in this oil, like as it was established in the tree (wood) that was its kin, even his might at that time, whereof they that crucified thee could not endure the word: let the gift also come whereby breathing upon his (thy) enemies thou didst cause them to go backward and fall headlong, and let it rest upon this oil, whereupon we invoke thy holy name". And having thus said, he poured it first upon the head of Iuzanes and then upon the

women's heads, saying: "In thy name, O Jesu Christ, let it be unto these souls for remission of sins and for turning back of the adversary and for salvation of their souls".¹⁰

At the baptism of Vizan, Syriac text.

"Fair fruit, that art worthy to be glowing with the word of holiness, that men may put thee on and conquer through thee their enemies, when they have been cleansed from their former works,—yea, Lord, come, abide upon this oil as thou didst abide upon the tree, and they who crucified thee were not able to bear thy word: Let thy gift come, which thou didst breathe upon thine enemies and they went backward and fell upon their faces, and let it abide upon this oil, over which we name thy name". And he cast it upon the head of Vizan, and then upon the heads of these (others), and said: "In thy name, Jesus the Messiah, let it be to these persons for the remission of offences and sins, and for the destruction of the enemy, and for the healing of their souls and bodies".¹¹

So far as these texts make any reference at all to the effects which might be expected from the unction, they do not seem to contain any suggestion that the effect will be the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in confirmation. On the other hand, it is not difficult to perceive points of contact with the interpretation of the pre-baptismal unction which we have already examined in the homily of Narsai. The appeal to Jesus as the "straightener of crooked limbs", as "life and health and remission of sins", the prayer to "heal her through this unction", the description of oil as "help and joy of the sick", the prayer at the administration of the unction to Mygdonia's forehead, "Heal her of her old wounds, and wash away from her her sins", the similar prayer at the administration of oil to Vizan's head "Let it be to these persons for the . . . healing of their souls and bodies": all these passages support the view that the unction was credited with a therapeutic power. Other passages likewise are consistent with the view that the unction had an apotropaic purpose, and hint also that the unction was made, presumably on the forehead, in the sign of the cross. Thus the oil is described in the Syriac text as "hidden mystery of the cross, which is seen through it", and in the Greek as "hidden mystery in which is manifested to us the cross". It is described also as "power of the cross, with which if they endue themselves men overcome their adversaries". In the last passage of the prayer over the oil at the baptism

of Vizan, both in the Greek and Syriac, the gift which is asked for is precisely the gift of apotropaic power: "Let thy gift come, which thou didst breathe upon thine enemies and they went backward and fell on their faces, and let it abide upon this oil". And in the prayers at the administration of unction to the head of Vizan and his companions, the "turning back of the adversary" or the "destruction of the enemy" are among its expected effects. All these passages appear to justify Woolley's estimate of the prayers and of the unction, that their purpose was exorcism.

The two works which we have hitherto examined tell a clear and consistent story. The pre-baptismal unction in their view was an exorcism, and they leave no room for the opinion that any sacramental bestowal of the Holy Spirit was intended. There are however two important documents which might give rise to the impression that confirmation was intended by the pre-baptismal unction. They are the Syriac *Didascalia*, written probably in the earlier part of the third century, and the Apostolic Constitutions, which is a Greek work of Syrian origin, written about 375.

Three passages in the *Didascalia* demand our attention, and we shall consider first the passage in which the writer speaks of the value of deaconesses in connection with baptism. The advantage of deaconesses was that in the baptism of women they were suitable people to perform the anointing of the whole body. The proper minister should perform the anointing on the head, and then deliver the female candidate to the deaconess to complete the anointing. Similarly in the Acts of Thomas, Mygdonia and Vizan's female companions were anointed first by Thomas upon the head, and then by other women upon the rest of the body. The *Didascalia* explains the reason for this:

But where there is a woman, and especially a deaconess, it is not fitting that women should be seen by men: except that in the imposition of hands thou (the bishop) mayest anoint the head only, as anciently priests and kings in Israel used to be anointed (3, 12, 3).

A comparison between the anointing of priests and kings on the one hand, and the post-baptismal unction of the Western rites on the other, is a commonplace among Western patristic writers, from the time of Tertullian. It is not surprising therefore if this passage from the *Didascalia* were to be regarded as evidence for the view that the pre-baptismal unction of the Syrian rite was really

confirmation: since it appears to explain the Syrian unction before baptism in the same terms as the Western writers explained the unction of confirmation after baptism. There are reasons however for doubting whether this view is correct, and the first of them arises from a further consideration of the passage which we have quoted above. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the comparison which the *Didascalia* makes between the unction of the Church and the unction of the old Israel is merely a comparison of the outward and visible features of the ceremony, that it is limited to the level of external considerations, and that there is no intention to make any comparison between the benefits and effects of the Church's unction and that of the Old Testament. In other words, the writer of the *Didascalia* is saying to the bishop that in the baptism of women he must limit the unction which he personally gives to the head only, and then continues by way of illustration to point out that the anointing of priests and kings was also made upon the head only: but he is not necessarily saying anything about the purpose or meaning of the rite. This interpretation of the passage in question is, to say the least, permissible: it also avoids a serious difficulty which is inherent in the view that a reference to confirmation is made in these words. The difficulty is that if the unction of the forehead by the bishop is to be understood as confirmation, the remaining unction of the whole body is left without explanation or interpretation, and some other explanation would need to be assumed. On the other hand, the impression which we have from the *Didascalia* is that the whole unction, both of head and body, was understood as one action, just as it was understood as one action by Narsai, and in the Acts of Thomas. In these other documents, the two administrations of oil, to head and to body, might be performed by different people; they might even be separated in time by a few hours; but they were clearly understood to make one action, and require one single explanation. The *Didascalia* also appears to assume that the unction was a unity, and in the case of the anointing of men it is treated as one.

An instructive parallel to the reference in the *Didascalia* to priests and kings in such a context is afforded us by an Egyptian source. In the Ethiopic Statutes of the Apostles¹² the following prayer appears in the course of a baptismal rite:

God, my Lord Almighty, the Father of our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ, stretch out thine hand invisible upon the fruit of this olive with which thou anointedst the Priests and Prophets; and thou hast given power to it with thine own hand, that for those who shall be anointed therewith it may be for healing and safety and benefit in all diseases and sicknesses, and for extermination of every Satanic adversary; make an unction by thine own grace, really to them for whom it is given, the Holy Spirit, through the name and through the power of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹³

The passage in the *Statutes of the Apostles* from which this prayer is quoted, that is to say, the lengthy Statute 40, has been edited by A. Salles.¹⁴ Salles is almost certainly correct in his view that this prayer is for the consecration of the oil for the pre-baptismal unction. In spite of the reference in the prayer to the Holy Spirit, and in spite of the reference to the anointing of priests and prophets, the purpose which the prayer quite clearly ascribes to the use of the oil is the same apotropaic and therapeutic purpose which we have seen attested elsewhere. The prayer therefore provides us with plain evidence that not every reference to the anointing of priests, kings, or prophets, must necessarily be understood to imply confirmation. It is possible that some such prayer as this was within the experience of the writer of the *Didascalia*, and it might even have influenced his choice of words.

There is a passage in the *Didascalia* which appears to indicate the writer's belief that it is the baptismal washing which imparts the Holy Spirit to the candidates for initiation. The reception of penitents into renewed fellowship with the Church is the subject of this passage, and the manner in which a penitent is to be received, after his penitence has been plainly shown, is set out in the following words:

In the same manner therefore as you baptize a heathen and afterwards receive him, so also you shall lay a hand upon this man [i.e. the penitent], while all pray for him, and then you shall lead him in and make him a participator in the Church, and the laying on of the hand shall be to him in place of baptism: for men receive the participation of the Holy Spirit either through the laying on of hands or through baptism (2, 41, 2).

The word "baptism" is sometimes used in a general way to refer not only to the baptismal washing, but to include other related rites:

in this case, however, it is to be noted that the gloss of the Apostolic Constitutions upon this passage uses the word λούσμα, and we are therefore justified in supposing that when this passage of the *Didascalia* speaks of "baptism" it refers to the actual baptismal washing. The comparison which is made in this passage between the treatment of the penitent Christian and of the heathen is thus quite clear: in either case, a sacramental act is performed outside the main body or building of the church, and the penitent or candidate for baptism is then led within to be received by the faithful into fellowship. In the case of the penitent, the sacramental act outside the church is the imparting of the Spirit by the laying on of hands: in the other case, the Spirit is imparted through the baptismal washing. There seems scant justification for identifying the laying on of hands for the reconciliation of penitents which is mentioned in this passage with the laying on of hands which accompanied the pre-baptismal unction, or of supposing that because the Holy Spirit was imparted in the laying on of hands in reconciliation, the same gift must also be imparted in other cases when hands were laid on. To put the matter in the plainest possible manner, if we were to take the last sentence in the passage quoted above and expand it in such a manner that it left no room for ambiguity or doubt, it would run as follows: For men receive the participation of the Holy Spirit either through the laying on of hands (*when they are penitent Christians being reconciled to the Church*) or through baptism (*when they are heathen entering the Church for the first time*). This passage offers no grounds for supposing that the laying on of hands in the pre-baptismal unction was a bestowal of the Holy Spirit: but it does very positively state that the Holy Spirit is imparted in the baptismal washing.

Our third quotation from the *Didascalia* is in the context of a passage in which demoniac possession is under discussion. The heathen, it says, are possessed by evil spirits, the faithful by the Holy Spirit. The writer speaks then of the heathen, and says:

There is no other cure, that the unclean spirit may depart from them, except through the sacred purgation and the holy baptism (nisi per sacram purgationem et sanctum baptismum) (6, 21, 5).

There can be no certainty about this, but it looks very much as though we have here a reference to baptism with its preceding exorcism. In that case, it carries the suggestion that the *Didascalia*

also bears witness to the interpretation of the pre-baptismal unction as an exorcism.

The three accounts of a baptismal rite which the Apostolic Constitutions afford us are so inconsistent that they can provide no dependable testimony to any one interpretation of the pre-baptismal unction. In fact, the book appears to mark a stage when a post-baptismal unction was being taken into Syrian usage. Thus, the rite described in Book 7, 22 is based upon that of the *Didache*: the rite of the *Didache* had no unctions, but in the Apostolic Constitutions two unctions are added, before and after the baptismal washing. Likewise the rite in Book 3, 16 is based upon that of the *Didascalia*, and adds an unction after baptism. Lastly, a rite described in Book 7, 39ff has no known literary affinities, and like the other two has an unction both before and after baptism.

From these sources, two passages may be found which relate the pre-baptismal unction to the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in clear terms. In Book 7 we have the following:

You shall anoint (him) first with holy oil, then you shall baptize (him) with water, and lastly you shall seal (him) with *muron*, so that the anointing may be a participation of the Holy Spirit, the water a symbol of (the) death, the *muron* a seal of the agreements (7, 22).

This passage certainly appears to offer some foundation for the belief that the pre-baptismal unction of the Syrian rite is to be understood as confirmation: but any confidence in the matter must surely be shaken by the surprising sentence which follows immediately:

But if there is neither oil nor *muron*, the water is sufficient both for the anointing and for the seal and for the confession of him that dies or indeed is dying together (with Christ).

In other words, neither of the unctions is essential to the rite—the vital thing is the baptism in water, which is sufficient for a complete initiation.

The rite of Book 3 is based upon the *Didascalia*. The passage about the use of deaconesses in baptism is copied out from the *Didascalia*, and continues:

But in the laying on of hands shall the bishop anoint her head only, after the manner in which priests and kings used formerly to

be anointed: not that hands are laid on those who are being baptized in order to make them priests, but Christians, as from the Christ (*i.e. the Anointed*), 'a royal priesthood and a holy nation, the church of God, pillar and ground' of the bridal chamber, 'who once were not a people', but now are elect and beloved. Thou therefore, O bishop, after that type shalt anoint the head of those that are being baptized, whether men or women, with the holy oil unto a type of the spiritual baptism.

We have seen cause to doubt whether the comparison in the parallel passage of the *Didascalia* between the pre-baptismal unction and the unction of priests and kings was sufficient reason to assume a reference to the theology of Confirmation. In this case, however, the writer seems quite clear that the unction before baptism bestows the privileges of the royal priesthood.

This account of the baptismal rite is followed by an interpretation of it, in the following words:

Baptism then is given into the death of Christ: the water is instead of the tomb, the oil instead of the Holy Spirit, the seal instead of the cross, the *muron* is a confirmation of the confession: the mention of the Father as of the Author and Sender, the joint-mention of the Spirit as of the Witness: the descent (into the water) is the dying together with (Christ), the ascent (from the water) the rising up with (Christ).

Some of the symbolism of this passage is consistent with its declared object, which is to show the parallels between baptism and the death of Christ. But some of it is not. Thus, the "joint-mention of the Spirit" (in the baptismal formula) is said to symbolize the Spirit's work as a "witness", and this, as Funk points out, contains a reference to the Spirit's activity in the baptism of Christ, and not in his death. It seems probable therefore that the parallel which is drawn between the oil and the Holy Spirit is likewise to be understood by reference to our Lord's baptism. It may therefore be taken as a possible reference to confirmation, if we are prepared to overlook the fact that the Spirit descended upon our Lord after he rose from the water and not before.

It appears to be permissible to draw from these passages in the third and seventh books of the Apostolic Constitutions the conclusion that the writer identified the pre-baptismal unction with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. It is nevertheless difficult to avoid

the impression that he did this, not because of any ecclesiastical tradition which spoke of confirmation as an essential part of Christian initiation, but out of a desire to find symbolic meaning in every external act of the rite which he was describing. He took an evident delight in suggesting a symbolism, partly scriptural, which related the experience of the candidates in baptism to the experience of our Lord, whether in his death or in his baptism. But if the identification of the unction with a bestowal of the Spirit rested only upon devotional grounds such as this, the writer would remain free to dispense with the use of unction, if the need arose. This would explain why he is so surprisingly ready to dispense with it in the passage quoted above from the seventh book. Similarly, he would be free to accord to the unction a quite different interpretation, if he had any reason to do so. This is in fact exactly what he does in the third rite, described in the seventh book, c. 39ff. In the course of this rite, we are given an account of the prayer over the oil, though not its text, in the following words:

And after this profession, he comes in order to the anointing with oil. This is blessed by the priest unto the remission of sins and the early preparation for baptism. For the priest calls upon the unbegotten God, the Father of Christ, the King of all life and experience, that he may sanctify the oil in the name of the Lord Jesus, and give it spiritual grace and efficacious power, the remission of sins and the early preparation of the confession of baptism, so that he that is anointed, being freed from all wickednesses, may become worthy of initiation according to the commandment of the Only-begotten.

The interpretation of the pre-baptismal unction which this passage implies is clearly different from the interpretation in the other passages of the Apostolic Constitution which we have examined. The unction in this case is certainly not the unction of confirmation; but its preparatory and apotropaic qualities suggest that it might be exorcism. The passage certainly seems to accord more closely with what we have quoted from the Acts of Thomas.

Inconsistency is the salient feature of these passages of the Apostolic Constitutions in their interpretation of the pre-baptismal unction. It seems impossible to reconcile them with the view that their writer had inherited from the Church any firm tradition that

Christian initiation required both a baptismal washing and a laying on of hands with unction in which the gift of the Holy Spirit was imparted. If he had done so, he could hardly have interpreted the unctions so variously, or shown himself so indifferent to their use. It seems far more probable that on the two occasions when he does write of the unction as a participation of the Holy Spirit, he propounds this interpretation as a device of devotional exegesis rather than as an exposition of the Church's ancient tradition and teaching.

The four documents which we have examined all attest a rite of initiation which was entirely made up of an unction before baptism, the baptismal washing, and the first administration of the Eucharist. If we are correct in the conclusion that the pre-baptismal unction ought properly to be understood as an exorcism, then it seems to follow that at an early date no rite of confirmation was practised in Syria.

¹ Thompson, *Offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 31; Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*; Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 188.

² Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 188, gives the fullest list.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁴ *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, E.T., vol. 2.

⁵ *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 2, pt. 2.

⁶ *The Apocryphal New Testament*.

⁷ *Exorcism and the Healing of the Sick*, London, 1931, p. 55.

⁸ James, *op. cit.*, p. 418.

⁹ Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

¹⁰ James, p. 433.

¹¹ Wright, p. 289.

¹² Edited and translated by G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

¹⁴ *Trois Antiques Rituels du Baptême*, *Sources chrétiennes*, No. 59.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE *

E. L. MASCALL

I

ONE OF the more notable features of the contemporary theological situation is the readiness, and indeed the anxiety, of many Protestant theologians to speak about the Eucharistic Sacrifice, regardless of the fact that the very term would have been repudiated with horror by most of their forbears as derogating from the uniqueness and the sufficiency of the offering made by Christ upon the Cross. One might be tempted merely to take this as a manifestation of a general tendency to spoil the Catholic Egyptians of their traditional vocabulary by recasting it in the moulds of Protestant theology; we might recall what has, for example, happened with the word "Catholic" itself, unscriptural though it may be. I do not think, however, that such a judgement would be either true or fair; rather is it the case that the whole understanding of sacrifice and of the Eucharist has been re-investigated in recent years, largely by thinkers on the Catholic side, in a way which has very deeply undercut on both sides the entrenched positions of the last four centuries.

The story will be familiar to many readers, but I must briefly tell it again. Late medieval theology, and its twin heirs the theologies of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, were dominated by a conception of sacrifice as being simply identical with the death of a victim, this death being considered in virtual isolation from all its circumstances, antecedent, concomitant, and subsequent. In consequence it was almost impossible to consider the Eucharist as a sacrifice without implying, first, that in it the slaying of Christ was in some way repeated and, secondly, that without the Mass the sacrificial efficacy of Calvary would be in some way defective. Whether or not the Augsburg Confession was right in accusing Roman theologians of holding that Christ was offered on the Cross for original sin alone, the offering for actual sins being made in the Mass—a charge which was instantly repudiated from the Roman side¹—the problem was clearly acute, and it led to a complete deadlock. On the one side the Protestants were arguing that Christ cannot be put to death again and so the

* This article is based upon a paper read at the conference of the Society for the Study of Theology held at Cambridge in March 1960.

Eucharist cannot be a sacrifice, while the Catholics were arguing that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and so Christ must be somehow put to death in it, neither side questioning the suppressed premiss which was common to both, namely that sacrifice simply consists in killing. For Catholics, therefore, the Eucharist was seen as a *repetition* of Calvary, while for Protestants it was at most a *commemoration* of Calvary, though some Protestants would not go further than seeing it as a commemoration of the Last Supper. The deadlock was not effectively eased by the general readiness of Catholic theologians to admit that the repetition was not a *literal* repetition and of many Protestant theologians to admit that it was not a *bare* commemoration, for the concepts of literalness and bareness have not been easy to define. The bypaths into which Catholic theology got led, in its attempt to find some feature of the Mass which corresponded to the killing on Calvary, have been discussed briefly in my small book *Corpus Christi*² and in Canon Masure's book *The Christian Sacrifice*,³ though the latter writer is perhaps understandably inclined to exonerate St Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent from any responsibility or complicity.⁴

Only in the present century has a way out of the deadlock begun to appear, and it has depended upon two factors. In the first place a far more balanced and inclusive view has developed of sacrifice ✓ in general and the sacrifice of Christ in particular. Dr Yerkes, in his book *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism*, has warned us not to be misled by the fact that the central feature of most sacrificial rites is a slaughtered animal, into supposing that sacrifice is necessarily sombre or terrifying. He reminds us that "the same rite may come to have totally different significance with groups of worshippers who are isolated from each other. For instance, among the Greeks the holocaust was always a terrible rite of aversion; among the Hebrews it became the greatest rite of adoration."⁵ He stresses the joyful character of the ancient Greek θυσία.⁶ I suppose that one way of making his point would be to say that we ought not to suppose, because the centre of a Christmas dinner is the carcase of a turkey, that the persons seated at the table are mourning its demise. It is, I think, in any case widely recognized that the ideas involved in the universal human institution of sacrifice are highly diverse and complex, and in any case we are not concerned with what it means in pagan or even Jewish religion but with Christianity. As Yerkes reminds us,

There is no word to take the place of sacrifice in the vocabulary of religion. Yahweh and Zeus and Dagon have long since ceased to have meaning for the religious man. The simple word *God* has replaced them all and has meaning greater than any of them or than all of them combined. As no man has yet fathomed or understood the full meaning of God, so none has yet exhausted the connotation of sacrifice. We may catch a glimpse of what the Jewish Psalmist meant when he sang, "God's zevach is a troubled spirit".⁷

For Masure, the great offender in this matter is Cardinal de Lugo, for whom the essence of sacrifice is the destruction of the victim and who sees this destruction as an act by which God's supremacy is recognized and God himself glorified and honoured. But Masure also recognizes that the great seventeenth-century French school of spirituality was deeply penetrated by this gloomy assumption. As he remarks,

Perhaps the spirituality of the Gallican Church for the last two or three centuries has yielded too easily here to a destructive pessimism under the real or merely verbal influence of Jansenism. M. Lepin, studying the doctrines of the French Oratory under the old order, has been constantly forced to rectify and to contest the theory of annihilation-sacrifice.⁸

Mersch has made much the same point, in writing *à propos* of Condren's teaching about Christ's offering of his nothingness to the Father,

This is indeed a wonderful vision, and yet . . . there is something frightening about it, like an immense desert landscape. The constant repetition of our nothingness, but most of all the peculiar glory that God is said to take in the fact that his Son is offered to him dead, are depressing details.

And of Olier he writes,

He is quite as exacting as Condren, except that he speaks rather of effacement than of immolation: one is reminded more of a candle burning itself out than of a victim being slaughtered. Apart from this, his doctrine presents exactly the same rigour as that of Condren, and we explain the two as one doctrine.⁹

In contrast to such pessimistic views Masure sees the essence of sacrifice to lie in the deliberate return of a creature to God its Creator to be accepted by him and to be transformed by being

accepted. That in a fallen world this return to God can only take place by a passage through death he emphatically maintains, but he insists that the purpose of the whole movement is not the destruction of the creature but its transformation and fulfilment. For the full working out of this notion it is necessary to refer to his magnificent exposition as a whole; its importance will, however, be immediately obvious, as will be its repercussions upon the doctrine of the Eucharist.

The second factor which has helped to ease the deadlock has been a reinvestigation of the relation between the Eucharist and the redeeming act of Christ. ✓

Masure's work was preceded by two other equally significant discussions, which coalesce with it remarkably though they approach the question from very different angles. De la Taille, in his great work *Mysterium Fidei*, completed in 1915, attempted to avoid the necessity of finding in the Eucharist some equivalent for the immolation of Calvary, by making a distinction between three elements in the notion of sacrifice, namely a ritual oblation, an immolation, and a divine acceptance. In the case of the one true sacrifice offered by Christ he sees the ritual oblation as taking place at the Last Supper, the immolation at the Crucifixion, and the divine acceptance at Christ's entry into the heavenly places. (A very similar view was independently developed by Sir Will Spens in his essay in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, published in 1926, and in subsequent articles in *Theology*.) What, then, on this view is the Mass? It cannot be a new *immolation*, for Christ cannot die again. It must therefore be a new *oblation*, one made after the immolation, an *oblatio hostiae immolatae*, as the Last Supper was an oblation made before the immolation, an *oblatio hostiae immolandae*. The strong points of this view are obvious: if it is true, the Mass brings about no change in Christ and inflicts no humiliation upon him; and although the death is a necessary element in the Sacrifice nothing prevents us—though neither de la Taille nor Spens explicitly took this step—from viewing the Sacrifice as one great and all-inclusive act of filial homage, which begins with the Incarnation and culminates in the triumphal entry into heaven. Nevertheless this view is open to the objection that, since in effect it makes the Eucharist a *part* of the sacrifice, it would appear to fall into one of the very errors that it seeks so studiously to avoid—that of making the Eucharist do something which the Cross is

unable to do. Needless to say, neither de la Taille nor Spens would have accepted this implication of their view, but in order successfully to rule it out it would seem to be necessary to supplement it by a further conception which Dom Anskar Vonier seems to have been the first to make, in his book *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, which was published in 1925, though it was perhaps anticipated by Billot,¹⁰ the conception of sacramental significance as an entirely unique type of efficient causality, which must not be confused with other types. According to this conception the Eucharist is not, so to speak, a further episode in the incarnate life of the divine Word but a re-presentation, under the sacramental signs, of the whole incarnate life in its atoning and propitiatory efficacy. The Mass is thus not a new sacrifice but a new presentation of the one complete sacrifice; it is a sacrifice indeed, but it is a sacrifice not because Christ is dying again on the altar as he died once upon the Cross, but because the bread and wine which are on the altar are the divinely appointed and designated sign of the sacrifice. I do not think Vonier ever saw his doctrine as a necessary supplement and corrective to that of de la Taille, but rather as excluding it; nevertheless the view which is characteristic of the best Catholic thought to-day would seem to be a synthesis of the teaching of de la Taille, Vonier, and Masure, a view according to which Christ's sacrifice, although it culminates on Calvary, includes his whole human life from the Incarnation to the heavenly glorification and is present in its entirety, under the sacramental signs and by the unique mode of sacramental signification, in the Sacrament of the Altar. I do not think that Mgr Journet could be described as a wildly unconventional theologian—such a description could hardly apply to some one who has written a vast ecclesiological treatise in which the four successive volumes deal with the Church under the respective headings of the four Aristotelian causes—but in his recent book *La Messe* the very subtitle—*Présence du Sacrifice de la Croix*—shows how deeply these newly recovered insights have affected his thought.

The doctrines of transubstantiation and the real presence [he writes] had already reached the stage of explicit statement when they were rejected by Protestantism. The doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Last Supper and the Mass, on the other hand, although firmly taught and believed, was still in the implicit stage. The Council of Trent . . . , in defining the first two points adopts what is in its

essence a doctrine already made precise. In defining the sacrificial character of the Supper and the Mass, on the other hand, it can be said that, while it utilised the previous theological elucidations—notably those of Cardinal Cajetan—it was forced to proceed in a certain degree towards a first explicitation . . .

The explicitation begun by the Council of Trent seems to be as yet unfinished. It calls for the work of theologians.¹¹

The Mass, Journet insists, in language markedly reminiscent of Vonier,

is a true and proper sacrifice: not another sacrifice than the unique redemptive sacrifice, but another presence, a sacramental presence, to us of that unique sacrifice.¹²

And again:

If there is only one redemptive sacrifice under the New Covenant, that of the Cross, how can the *Last Supper* be a sacrifice? There is only one answer: the Supper is not *another* sacrifice than the sacrifice of the Cross, it is the sacrifice of the Cross itself, *already begun at that time* and made present, as it will be later on, under the appearance of bread and wine.

And if there is only one redemptive sacrifice under the New Covenant, that of the Cross, how can the *Mass* be a true sacrifice? There is again only one answer: the Mass is not *another* sacrifice than that of the Cross. The sacrifice, both here and there, is substantially and essentially identical; for both here and there the priest is identical and the victim is identical. It is different only accidentally, modally, that is to say, in its mode of presentation; for in the one case Christ, present under his natural and proper appearance, offered himself by shedding of blood and without making use of any minister, while in the other case Christ, present under sacramental and strange appearances, offers himself without shedding of blood, utilising the ministry of priests. It is impossible that the sacrifice of the Mass should compete against that of the Cross; the whole work of the Mass is to represent and to make present to us the sacrifice in which there was shedding of blood and to apply to us its saving power for the remission of the sins which we commit each day.¹³

Furthermore, although he makes use of the conventional phrase "the sacrifice of the Cross", Journet explicitly states that it is more inclusive than that term would suggest.

The Passion of Christ [he writes] was only the end of his pilgrimage, it was not the end of his life. It was a death containing in advance the Resurrection, a suffering containing in advance felicity, an apparent defeat containing in advance a manifest victory. And it is as such, that is to say as uniting in itself all these contrasts, that it is the cause of our salvation. To speak truly, the Passion, the Death, the Resurrection and the Ascension were, in the strictest sense, the moments of a single act, begun in pain and completed in glory, by which the Saviour descended into the realm of captive humanity in order to lift it to the heights.¹⁴

We may note, however, that Journet does not here explicitly trace the redeeming act back to its beginning in the conception of the Word in Mary's womb.

Journet is determined to maintain not only that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Mass, but that his sacrifice is present too. He is much more clear about this than is St Thomas, who allows himself on one occasion to say that Christ is immolated in the Sacrifice in the sense in which "the images of things are called by the names of the things of which they are images, as when we look on a picture or a fresco and say 'That is Cicero'." ¹⁵ It is not, however, easy within the framework of Aristotelian philosophy to give an account of the sacramental presence of an act, any more than to give an account of the sacramental presence of an object. Journet introduces the distinction between what he calls "substantial presence" and "operative presence", and he insists that in both cases the word "presence" is used in a true and proper, not in a metaphorical, sense, while on the other hand the two uses of the word are not univocal but analogical.

Christ is glorified [he writes]; how can he be present to us *as priest and victim*? The unique redemptive sacrificial act is *past* in relation to us, how can it be efficaciously *present* to us, as it was to the Apostles at the Last Supper, and to the Virgin and St John at the Cross? That is the problem.

If it can be solved, the Mass will be, like the Supper, a true and proper sacrifice, bringing to us under the sacramental appearances, without shedding of blood, simultaneously the *substantial* presence of Christ and the application, the contact, the *operative* presence of his redemptive sacrificial act.

The Mass will then be not *another sacrifice* than the unique redemptive sacrifice, but *another presence*, an operative presence—

when we are concerned with an act and not a substance, an operative presence is the only one which can be involved—of the unique redemptive sacrifice, a sacramental presence, without shedding of blood, of the unique sacrifice which was with shedding of blood. We can say: just as each consecrated host is Christ substantially, because it multiplies the substantial real presence of the one Christ, so analogically each Mass is a true and proper sacrificial act, because it multiplies the operative real presences of the one redemptive sacrifice.¹⁶

I do not think we need concern ourselves with the adequacy of Journet's application of scholastic concepts to the matter in hand; it is, however, important to recognize and welcome his insistence that each Mass is not a new sacrifice, but a new and genuine sacramental presentation of the one and unique sacrifice of our redemption.

I shall have something to say later on about the light which has been thrown upon the Eucharistic Sacrifice by the recovery of emphasis upon the nature of the Church as the Body of Christ. I shall, however, now turn to examine the teaching of some representative theologians in the Protestant communions.

2

Professor J. D. Benoit, in his striking little book *Liturgical Renewal: Studies in Catholic and Protestant Developments on the Continent*, has some remarkably trenchant criticisms of the traditional Calvinist French Liturgy, which he compares to its great disadvantage with the recently introduced new rite, whose first draft appeared in 1948. He describes it as catechetical, sermonizing, polemical, sombre and joyless, dominated by the shadow of the Cross, unilluminated by the light of the Resurrection: "it was unlike any other form of worship, quite unrelated to the great ecumenical tradition of Christendom, like a boulder in the midst of a stream."¹⁷ The Eucharist, he says,

is more than just a memorial—the memory, that is, of a past event. The Lord's supper is a re-presentation of the event. It actualises it; it makes it something that is happening now, so that its effects may be made operative, now and always.¹⁸

And the event in question is the crucifixion, the sacrifice of Calvary. St Augustine, he tells us,

affirmed the necessity of [the] sacrifice of ourselves in union with the unique sacrifice of Jesus Christ. . . . It is not a case of my offering myself individually to Jesus Christ. I offer myself in and with the community. It is, then, the community, the Church itself which offers itself to God as a living and holy sacrifice, a sacrifice which is renewed at each celebration of the Lord's Supper, in communion with the sacrifice of Christ.¹⁹

The late D. M. Baillie, in his book *The Theology of the Sacraments*, has a chapter headed "The Eucharistic Offering". Recognizing, as does Benoit, that the violence of much of the language of the sixteenth-century Reformers was due to their reaction against late medieval abuses, and asserting that the only offering that we can make to God is *the offering of ourselves*, he nevertheless insists that "we can only make an offering in union with Christ's eternal sacrifice". He approves such Catholic theologians as Masure for not minimizing the sacrifice of Christ but rather building everything on it, and insists that "in the sacrament we plead the sacrifice of Christ and in union with him offer ourselves to God".²⁰

Much more radical than either Benoit or Baillie, however, is Dr J. Leenhardt, in his essay entitled "This is my Body", which, together with Dr Cullmann's essay "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity", is published in the booklet *Essays on the Lord's Supper*. "I see a positive advantage", he writes, "in the use of expressions which Protestants were once obliged to repudiate because of the times in which they lived. That reason is precisely that we live no longer in their times." Again, he writes,

I know certain Roman theologians who work with a sincere ardour and not without effect to remove from historical Catholicism its inexact expressions and its choking overlay. Some of them react against certain errors which the Reformers condemned in the papist mass and against eucharistic superstitions. . . . Who can say what would have been the attitude of our Reformers if they could have found, to reply to their disquiet concerning fidelity to the Word of God, men such as these who today run a risk in an attempt to re-discover what is authentic Catholicism?²¹

At the Last Supper, he tells us, assuming that the Last Supper was in fact the Passover meal, "Jesus Christ, at the moment when he should have spoken of the lamb, mentions his body".²² "At the

instant of leaving his disciples, he wishes that, after the arrest and all that follows, his presence shall continue to be real and active as before. The Paschal rite is intended to assure this permanent actuality of the redemptive acts of God.”²³ Leenhardt explicitly asserts the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. “When we speak of the Lord’s Supper as a sacrifice—in the correct sense of the term—we wish to do justice to that intuition of faith that the redemptive action of God in Christ, which culminated in the sacrifice of the Cross, has not ceased to be efficacious and is prolonged in order to reach every generation.”²⁴ He insists that, in the thought of St Paul, with its Hebrew background, ἀνάμνησις, “remembrance was not for him mental recollection, an evocative thought. Remembrance was for him the restoration of a past situation which has for the moment disappeared. To remember is to make present and actual.”²⁵ “What happens [in the Lord’s Supper] is what took place during the ministry; it is what is going to happen on the Cross; it is the same gift under different forms, it is the same sacrifice which accomplishes the same service, which realises the same ministry.”²⁶ Here in different words we have almost the exact teaching that we have already found in Journet; to have effected such a *rapprochement* is indeed an achievement.

We might note one odd feature of Leenhardt’s discussion. His discussion of the Eucharist is entirely confined to the bread and the Body; there is not a single mention of the cup or the Blood, except in an incidental reference to the manner of conducting the service.²⁷ When we think of the emphasis which Protestantism has placed upon the restoration of the chalice to the laity, it is astonishing to find a Protestant theologian who can build up his whole theology of the Eucharist upon the bread, as if the rite did not contain the cup at all; this is a feat that no Roman theologian has achieved, and I think it must be admitted that it introduces a certain lack of balance into Leenhardt’s discussion.

In Dr Geddes MacGregor’s book *Corpus Christi: The Nature of the Church according to the Reformed Tradition* there is a discussion of the Eucharist which, if he does not go as far as some of the Continental writers, is remarkable for its readiness to reopen the whole question of the Sacrifice.

It is by no means improbable [he writes] that [the Reformers’] rejection of the medieval doctrine that Christ’s sacrifice was

"repeated" or "renewed" in the Mass coloured their thought on the subject of eucharistic sacrifice so as to cause them to overlook certain theological questions of considerable importance for the Reformed tradition. That the Eucharist was from the earliest times accounted in some sense a sacrifice is abundantly plain.²⁸

Again MacGregor writes:

What is unfortunate in the wording of the *Westminster Confession* is that it makes it appear as though nothing really happens in the Eucharist because everything has happened already, so that we are not to be allowed to do anything but pay homage to the memory of this. The Westminster divines, in guarding against the danger of reversion to the attitude that had engendered the Mass . . . , used language that fails to draw attention to the indubitable need and duty of the Church to participate in the work of its Lord, according to the peculiarly intimate relation in which, at his bidding, it stands to him.²⁹

Thus,

while it is a truism, according to the Reformed tradition, to say that we have nothing to offer to God that is worthy of him, it is not to be denied that God, notwithstanding, desires us to bring our offerings of prayers, such as they are, and what greater offering and oblation can we bring than the Eucharist which he has commanded us to "do" ? ³⁰

(To be continued)

¹ Cf. B. J. Kidd, *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 54f; P. F. Palmer, *Sacraments and Worship*, pp. 298f.

² Pp. 85f.

³ Pp. 221f.

⁴ If Fr Francis Clark's newly published book *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* is correct in its conclusions the judgement expressed above on late medieval theology would need considerable revision; the discussion in the remainder of this article will, however, not be substantially affected.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 17.

⁶ Ibid., ch. ix.

⁷ Ibid., p. 160.

⁸ Op. cit., p. 31. Cf. J. Galy, *Le Sacrifice dans l'Ecole Française de Spiritualité*, passim.

⁹ *The Whole Christ*, pp. 547-8.

¹⁰ Cf. Masure, op. cit., p. 226.

¹¹ *La Messe: Présence du Sacrifice de la Croix* (Paris, Desclée), p. 15.

¹² Ibid., p. 11.

¹³ Ibid., p. 54.

- 14 Ibid., p. 30.
- 15 *S. Theol.*, III, lxxxiii, 1c.
- 16 *Op. cit.*, p. 86.
- 17 *Op. cit.*, p. 36.
- 18 Ibid., p. 44.
- 19 Ibid., p. 41.
- 20 *Op. cit.*, pp. 115f.
- 21 *Op. cit.*, pp. 26, 27.
- 22 Ibid., p. 41.
- 23 Ibid., p. 48.
- 24 Ibid., p. 58.
- 25 Ibid., p. 61.
- 26 Ibid., p. 62.
- 27 Ibid., p. 76.
- 28 *Op. cit.*, p. 188.
- 29 Ibid., p. 247.
- 30 Ibid., p. 191.

THOMAS ARNOLD

M. J. JACKSON AND J. ROGAN

THE DISCOVERY of leading thinkers of the nineteenth century continues, but it is only now reaching Thomas Arnold.¹ He is known, of course, as a famous headmaster who exercised considerable influence over his pupils and set a pattern for the public schools. In so far as he is supposed to have possessed any ideas they are popularly thought to be centred upon the classics and organized sports. Those who take the trouble to read his letters and works will soon perceive that they are in contact with a powerful critic of the spirit and events of his own times, whose basic ideas, even yet, are not without significance for the student of Church and society.² Regrettable though it is that he never produced an extended creative work, it is possible to build a coherent picture of his thoughts from his occasional pieces. Though his observations about society were from the side-lines, pulling the bell to give the alarm, as he said, Arnold was headmaster of a leading school, he maintained his contact with Oxford, whose chair of modern history he held at the close of his life, and his correspondence shows him not to have been without influence in public affairs. Melbourne considered him for a bishopric but passed him over, fearing an uproar if he were appointed. Arnold in the 1830s was a controversial figure.

As a public critic of the emergent industrial society Arnold made his first appearance through his own short-lived paper the *Englishman's Register*.³ He continued his criticism in the *Sheffield Courant*.⁴ In later years he returned to the same themes in the *Hertford Reformer*.⁵ He was amazed to find the missionary and anti-slavery societies labouring at the corners of the earth when in their own midst lurked "the worst evils of slavery and heathenism".⁶ He was particularly sensitive to the affront to human dignity in the factory system and in the new industrial towns. In his view the evil for the manufacturing populations lay in the fact that "it implies the congregation of a vast multitude within a comparatively narrow space and with an object purely commercial. In other words they are regarded as *hands*—not as heads, hearts or souls."⁷ The very appearance of the early nineteenth-century manufacturing town was miserable and has been frequently described. Not only did Arnold note its squalor, he perceived that

in industrial society relationships of long standing were overturned and new ones, perhaps less desirable, created. Farmers, for example, took no more notice of their labourers "than if they were dumb beasts".⁸

Like many other Englishmen he attributed the distresses of the 1820s and 30s to the Napoleonic Wars, which, he thought, deranged the state of society. He saw that there was a growing indigenous working class society of which he did not entirely approve. They were "without the organisation of regular society" so that "the organisation which they have among themselves is rather mischievous than beneficial—they are formed into clubs and unions—associations which breathe a narrow and selfish spirit at best, but which, under favourable circumstances become mere gangs of conspirators".⁹ It was the common fear of a Jacobin revolution on the French model. Industrialism might create a slave society. If it did, an explosion would be engineered by the slaves' leaders. He believed that in Chartism he saw such a rebellion burning under the surface of the kingdom. The Chartists' indifference to old institutions and their carelessness about history were indications both of their menace and their slavish mentality. Arnold stood firmly for the education of the working class and the raising of its standard of living.

As the political atmosphere was changing and with it the ideas and nomenclature of the parties Arnold came forward as a critic of the new Conservatism. "Conservatism always looks backwards and therefore under whatever form of government, I think it the enemy of all good."¹⁰ While he attributed in part the troubles of the times "to the excess of aristocracy in our whole system",¹¹ nonetheless he hoped that the aristocracy, whose power was already being checked by the new merchant classes, would join working class organizations to provide an alternative leadership and to help prepare the workers for responsible use of the benefits of parliamentary reform. Unlike some he did not regard parliamentary reform as the one change needful. While he supported it along with other items of reform from emigration to a new deal in local government, he held that the *malaise* of society went deeper. It called into question the meaning of politics—the purpose of society, its goals, and thus its relation with the Church.

Arnold held a very high view of politics. "What I wish for above all things, is that men would talk, write and act on political

subjects, in the fear of God; as if they were forthwith going to stand before His judgment." ¹² Politics he defined in the Greek sense as society in connection with the highest welfare of man. He did not think that the State should merely hold the ring. He opposed "that wretched doctrine of Warburton's that the State had only to look after body and goods". ¹³ The State had a nobler end—the improvement of mankind. Given this distant goal, politics was the art of achieving approximations to this end, an improvement here and an abuse corrected there. In his political philosophy Arnold built a strong theological and philosophical basis for reform.

In his political philosophy there was an emphasis on the corporate nature of the State. Of course the individual still had its place, but there was too much talk of individual political rights. Such talk encouraged men to look upon themselves as independent of their fellows. The State had greater claims than the individual had. "Individuals, in a political sense, are necessarily members; as distinct from the body, they are nothing." ¹⁴ Critics believe a disruptive individualism to have been a feature of middle class industrial society. Arnold understood its origins: the age of chivalry and Jacobinism! The aims and purposes of the State confined men in certain ways. As in ancient commonwealths religion and morals were the tests of citizenship, he thought, therefore, that the individual should profess the State's religion and thus disapproved of giving Jews full citizenship. The contemporary movement towards a secular, neutralist State, which held the ring was foreign to the Christian moralist, whose studies had also taken him deep into Greek political history and thought.

Christianity was in a special sense the bond of society, for Church and State shared the same moral ends. If the State is really Christian how can it have a different end from that of the Church. The doctrine of the King's Supremacy was "the very cornerstone of all my political belief", ¹⁵ Arnold wrote. Popery, High Churchism, Independency, and all advocacy of separation came under his fire. In England the Established Church and the Dissenters were vital to the nation; religious questions were also political and political questions religious in our way of life. The clergy thus had a political and educational rôle in society. They "are directly called upon to Christianize the nation: not only to inculcate the private virtues of the Gospel but its pure and holy principles in their full

extent; those divine laws of which it may indeed be said that their voice is the harmony of the world".¹⁶

This identity of Church and State removes any false distinction between sacred and secular. "I cannot understand what is the good of a national Church if it be not to Christianize the Nation, and introduce the principles of Christianity into man's social and civil relations, and expose the wickedness of that spirit which maintains the game laws, and in agriculture and trade seems to think that there is no such sin as covetousness, and that if a man is not dishonest; he has nothing to do but to make all the profit of his capital that he can."¹⁷ "There is a certain reluctance amongst many who are very zealous supporters of the outward establishment of Christianity, to admitting its principles in the concerns of common life, in matters belonging to their trade or profession or above all in the conduct of national affairs. They will not tolerate its spirit in their everyday practice but ridicule it as visionary and impracticable."¹⁸

A noble theory; but the Church was failing. An international fellowship had partly broken down into national units, which in turn splintered into dissenting groups. Dissenters prevented a national appeal. No progress could be made till these divisions were remedied. Division of the churches was one evil; another was their failure to come to grips with the life of the new industrial areas. The outcry against the Church and bishops in particular was loudest in manufacturing areas. "Is it not because in our large manufacturing towns the Church has allowed thousands and ten thousands of its members to grow up in misery and ignorance; and that a stepmother's neglect is naturally requited by something of a stepmother's unpopularity?"¹⁹ What was the use of making difficulties about the dangers of parliamentary interference and the threats to Church property and privilege when the very end for which Establishment was conceived was left unattained?

His idea of a comprehensive national Church brought him into conflict with much orthodox opinion including the new Oxford Movement. Union with the Free Churches is still talked of and continues to be the subject of reports. Arnold's *Principles of Church Reform*²⁰ was the first recall to unity since the failure of noble designs at the Glorious Revolution, but unlike the previous appeals his was edged with the constant awareness that Christianity was called to minister in a society changing with

ever increasing rapidity. As a new world came to birth the division of the Church left Christians more averse to each other than to ungodliness and wickedness. The scorn which greeted his proposal of comprehension revealed the truth of his criticism.

A comprehensive national Church, embracing all denominations, required certain reforms in the existing Established Church, so that the new Church could be an effective instrument of mission in industrial society. Arnold advocated the commutation of tithes, an entire remodelling of the episcopal order, the redivision of dioceses, the creation of new parishes in industrial towns, and proper discipline over the clergy. Tithes he thought irritated more than they achieved financially. The remodelled episcopacy needed to remove the scandals of "High and Dry" prelacy. The redivided dioceses would give the Church efficient government, with a better distribution of income, which would principally benefit new industrial parishes. A better form of discipline would lift the standard of clerical conduct by reducing the scope of sporting parsons.

To many the main offence of the *Principles of Church Reform*²¹ lay in its advocacy of union without insistence upon doctrinal agreement: Arnold having concluded that theology as such had not been the major cause of schism but rather social factors. Underneath disputes about liturgy and dogma he saw a large measure of practical and doctrinal agreement. The moral precepts of the Gospel, the doctrine of the Trinity, the uniqueness of the saving works of Christ were common to all. It is true Roman Catholics and Unitarians presented difficulties; but these he thought could be overcome. The national Church of England should allow variety of opinion. It was foolish to think that all men at all times and in all places could or would think alike. The acceptance of a common faith in God and our Saviour should be the sole requirement.

The text-books traditionally bring in Arnold as an introduction to the Oxford Movement and make use of his aphorism that no power on earth could save the Church as it was in 1832. Arnold was an early and powerful critic of the Oxford Movement. His opposition was simple. He thought that the new movement sharpened the distinction between secular and sacred, transformed the Church into a sect and then narrowed it to the priesthood. From this position he went on to attack rites, ceremonies, and doctrines, especially that of Apostolic Succession. His article in

the *Edinburgh Review* ²² was a severe counter attack upon the Tractarians for their own assault upon Dr Hampden, though no worse than they had delivered to their opponents. When editing Arnold's works and compiling his biography Stanley did not see fit to reprint this polemic, so far had the tide flowed towards concern about the internal life of the Church; and indeed the more personal side of *odium theologicum* is best forgiven and forgotten. It was fair to raise the question, however, whether the contemporary situation in new industrial England, did not make the churchman's concern for Apostolic Succession, the dominical authority of episcopacy and the Catholicity of the Church either superstitious or irrelevant. Behind this question were others about the purpose of the Church and its relation to society, which was Keble's starting point in the Assize Sermon on national apostasy. Arnold was quick to grasp that the new movement was no continuation of the old ineffective "High and Dry" Church but one with assumptions and attitudes which ran counter to his own. In its first years the Oxford Movement showed few signs of that later social concern, which sent devoted priests to work in industrial slums, and Arnold's early death denied him the chance of seeing it.

In recent years there has been much talk about the pattern of the Church's ministry. Part-time priests and a permanent order of deacons have been mooted. Arnold had views on this subject ²³ within the context of the Church's mission to society. His call for permanent deacons was based upon the need to minister more effectively in new industrial areas. A diaconate would supply ministry without the burden of great expense while supplying the Church's lack of non-commissioned officers. Such men would bridge the gap between clergy and laity by following their secular callings and by giving their spare time to ministerial work. Such an order would, moreover, enable men to enter the ministry who would not otherwise be able to do so. Men "of inferior rank and fortune, who cannot afford the expense of a university education . . . but who may have gifts which enable them to serve the Church effectually and who may naturally and lawfully wish not to let these gifts lie idle".²⁴

Work of this kind, he thought, could bring a closer unity between the churches, as those who became dissenting preachers might well become deacons in the national Church. Many became preachers of that sort he believed, not because they objected to

Church doctrine but because they had no means of following what they felt their calling to be, in their own Church. Such part-time ministry would be a step towards a truly national Church. It was a bold proposal for 1840. To-day advocates of part-time ministry blur the rôle of laymen. No such accusation could be brought against Arnold, whose greatest achievement, perhaps, was the forming of conscientious lay Christians, who gave distinguished service to Church and State.

Arnold's critical mind was also turned upon the professional ministry of the Church. He attacked low worldly men who entered the ministry: "ministers not of the Gospel but of the aristocracy who belong to Christianity only from the accident of its being established by law."²⁵ More significantly, he thought that many of the clergy were not equipped for their task, which was "to do good of the highest kind, to enforce in their public teaching the purest principles and practice that mankind have ever yet been made acquainted with . . . spreading amongst all ranks the wholesome influence of a good life, a cultivated understanding and the feelings and manners of true gentlemen".²⁶ Clerical understanding of contemporary society was small and their appreciation of its problems limited. In supporting the repeal of the Test Act and the emancipation of Roman Catholics Arnold²⁷ asked how clergy could hope to speak about questions of which they were ignorant, since their orders did not confer knowledge without the necessity of study. They could do worse than read systematically and think systematically in the field of what is now known as social science.

To review some of Thomas Arnolds' thinking is to liberate him from Lytton Strachey and the prison of his headmastership, with its echoes of fresh air, organized games, public school Christianity, upright pious English colonists and missionaries "doing good" to natives beyond Calais. He is revealed as an acute social and ecclesiastical critic. Moreover, he gives us a new and more healthy view of the history of the nineteenth-century Church, where the dust of internal controversies has obscured the whole question of the Church's obligation to society. As for his appeals for reform, Stephen Neill has written: "Many of the ideals of Arnold came to be quietly adopted in the Church, though not yet in their fullness or in every detail; Arnold and Stanley would have felt themselves quite at home as members of the joint gathering of Anglicans and Free Churchmen which in 1950 produced the report *Church Relations in*

England",²³ but his contribution lay at a deeper level, for if all that Arnold advocated had been put into immediate effect the deeper problems of mission and culture in an industrial society would still remain. His significance lies in his perspective, in his vision as a social critic, and as a missionary theologian. He thought sociologically. He understood the social context within which the Church was placed by the Industrial Revolution and perceived that an effective strategy of mission must be based upon such an understanding, or else it must fail. Arnold understood that there were social pressures upon men which affected their religious attitudes and behaviour; the crude conflict of the factory system; the miserable "East ends" of industrial cities; the impossibility of transplanting religious practice from country to town and the Church's apparent inability to make provision for the multitudes drifting into them. A new expression of Christianity was called for with new structures, which would be relevant to the new society.

Arnold built his thinking as a missionary theologian upon the tradition of Anglican theology stemming from Hooker that held Church and State as religious and political aspects of the same society. In nineteenth-century England, as to-day, this was far from the case but remained an aspiration and also a criterion for judging the Church's relations with society. The attacks showered upon him from Evangelicals and Tractarians were often in reply to the implied charge that they isolated religion from its social context. The one preached a personal religion and the other a City of God withdrawn from the world in the life of its own purity. A private religion and morality was a scandal to Arnold given the many social evils of the day; it was in fact to condone the conventional morality and ideology of the age, perhaps not of the whole nation but at any rate a section of it. To withdraw into a private religious preserve was to be sectarian and abdicate from Christian responsibility for the good ordering of society. The Hookerian ideal, which Arnold tried to reinterpret in the new industrial society of the nineteenth century, set the Church certain social goals. This implied on the part of the Church a continuing involvement with and critique of the institutions of society. What Arnold did himself in his own theological and social writings and comments, he desired the Church as a whole to do. When large sections of the Church including some of its best minds were apparently failing to commit themselves to this task, they came under his fire.

The crux of the matter was and still is the Establishment. For many decades the Establishment has been under attack. Some within the Church have asserted its right to go its own way and possess its freedom. When faced with public opposition to its plans they have demanded freedom to legislate; when troubled by doctrine and rebellious clergy they have called for its right to determine and appoint its own. The idea of Establishment reminds the Church of its duty to society. The Church does not exist on behalf of itself; but it is a permanent temptation to hope that it does. The Royal Supremacy with the attendant Establishment of Christianity implies a unity of Church and Society and marks out a rôle of service for the Church within society. The general assault to-day upon the social Establishment and the unlamented decay of the ecclesiastical ought not to obscure the fact that Christianity is relevant to the life and institutions of society. It can be the vital basis of a public philosophy. The Church has a rôle not only to protest about the world from behind the walls of its own citadel but a responsibility to support the good in the world and to minister to men in the varied situations of secular life. It is there that Establishment is to be operative, not in the dignity of traditional forms, ceremonies, and pageantries, but in penetration of the life and thought of the nation. Arnold once wrote in these terms and went on to say: "For these reasons, I most earnestly admire and love a Church Establishment; and because it has in it the means of doing all this better, I think, than any other sect of Christians, therefore I value and would most rigorously reform *the actual Church Establishment*."²⁹

¹ T. W. Bamford, *Thomas Arnold*, 1960, is the latest biography, with a stress on Arnold's interests outside Rugby, following B. Willey's study of Arnold in *Nineteenth Century Studies*, 1949. C. K. Gloyn, *The Church in the Social Order*, 1942, has a good chapter on Arnold's social philosophy, while J. M. Murry, *The Price of Leadership*, 1939, relates Arnold's educational policy to his political theory.

² "Thomas Arnold outthought the Church of his day by generations, and not yet have we matched his teaching." E. R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City*, p. 86.

³ *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold*, ed. A. P. Stanley, 1845, Extracts from *The Englishman's Register*, 1831, pp. 113-67.

⁴ *Ibid.*, esp. Letters on the Social Conditions of the Working Classes, 1831-2, pp. 171-226.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Letters to *Hertford Reformer*, 1837-41, pp. 431-519.

⁶ A. P. Stanley, *The Life of Thomas Arnold*, Teachers' Edition, 1901, p. 489.

- 7 *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 456.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 178.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 462
- 10 *Stanley*, p. 391.
- 11 *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 175.
- 12 *Ibid.*, pp. 517-18.
- 13 *Stanley*, p. 501.
- 14 *Fragments on Church and State*, posthumous, ed. A. P. Stanley, p. 53.
- 15 *Stanley*, p. 535.
- 16 *Fragments on Church and State*, appendix 1.
- 17 *Stanley*, p. 243.
- 18 *Sermons*, 7th edition, 1861, p. vi.
- 19 *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 210.
- 20 *Ibid.*, *Principles of Church Reform*; with Postscript, 1833, pp. 257-338.
- 21 Some of the reactions to the pamphlet are to be found in *Stanley*, ch. VIII, and Gloyn, p. 94.
- 22 Vol. lxiii, 1836.
- 23 *Miscellaneous Works*, pp. 425-9.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 428.
- 25 *Edinburgh Review* article, 1836.
- 26 *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 220.
- 27 *Ibid.*, *The Christian Duty of Conceding the Roman Catholic Claims*, 1829, pp. 1-78.
- 28 Stephen Neill, *Anglicanism*, 1958, p. 247.
- 29 *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 220.

UNITING THE MINISTRIES

T. DONALD SULLY

A REISSUE of *The Reunion of the Church*,¹ first published in 1948, should be welcomed as it still has a contribution to make in the furtherance of understanding among the Churches and the cause of reunion, as well as in the more particular understanding of the formation and development of the Church of South India. The book itself has not been revised but reprinted; the revision consisting of the addition of an important introduction of twenty-eight pages which seeks to bring the book in some respects up to date. This it does in three sections relating to (a) the development of the ecumenical movement and its bearing on reunion, (b) the preference shown by the Lambeth Conferences of 1948 and 1958 for the method of reunion adopted in Ceylon and North India, and (c) the developments since 1947 in the Church of South India itself.

In this review we shall be mainly concerned with the second part of this Introduction in which Bishop Newbigin indulges in a trenchant criticism of the method of a unification of ministries and the whole conception of "supplemental ordination".

1. *Lambeth's preference*: Bishop Newbigin singles out two grounds for this preference given to the schemes in C. and N.I.P., first the Statement of Faith, and secondly the method of unification of ministries at the outset. We need not stay over the first, in which he gives in parallel columns the C. and C.S.I. Statements (ignoring differences in that of N.I.P.). It is easy to take out one phrase, "Redeemer of the world", from a carefully balanced sentence, to ignore another part of the same sentence, "being Himself God incarnate", and then to say that the first phrase is inadequate and could be accepted by a Hindu. But such criticism is not likely to affect this issue, if indeed it is a real one; and one may agree that "neither in Ceylon nor in North India (and, we might add, in the C.S.I.) is there any intention to depart from the historic faith".²

The second ground calls for more careful examination, as the Bishop's main point is that the method of unification is still substantially that of "supplemental ordination", and therefore is still subject to the criticisms of that conception contained in chapter vii of his book. If this is to be established there is need of a far more careful examination both of the meaning of supplemental

ordination and of its relation to the method in C. and N.I.P. than our author has provided, and no doubt that is what he would desire. We may agree with him that it is unfortunate that the further theological study of supplemental ordination asked for in the Appendix to the 1948 Lambeth Report (p. 66) does not seem to have been forthcoming; though we might have expected that the author himself could have contributed to that study instead of quoting from the Appendix as though it had disposed of the issues.

2. *Supplemental Ordination*: Shortly, as the Bishop puts it,³ it is "the attempt to combine a recognition of an existing ordination with the addition to it of something which also has the character of ordination". In chapter vii he gives the original American proposal quoted in a letter of 1943 from Bishops Palmer and Western to Bishop Azariah.

"The expression 'supplemented ordination' is intended to imply that he who receives it is recognized to have been truly ordained to the ministry of Christ's Church and that by the supplemental rite he receives such further grace of orders and such authority for the wider exercise of his ministry as, according to God's will, may be conveyed through the action of the Church in and by which the rite is performed."

Bishops Palmer and Western added from the Anglican point of view, "The essence of the problem is to find a way by which, on the one hand, Orders such as we Anglicans have inherited from the undivided Church should be given to those who have not previously received them; while, on the other hand, it should be recognized that their ordinations have made them true ministers of Christ's Word and Sacraments, and also that Anglican ministers should receive something more than an extension of jurisdiction such as could be given by constitutional enactment without any prayer or laying on of hands."

(a) Thus for supplemental ordination there must have been already a real ordination to the ministry of Christ's Church. It differs from a "Re-ordination" which carries the implication that any previous so called ordination was not real or valid. (There is, of course, a similar implication in the term "re-baptism".) It also differs from a "conditional ordination", where any previous ordination is in doubt. Yet there is something lacking or defective in that previous ordination, so that it is not parallel to the way in which the Anglican Prayer Book calls the consecration of a Bishop

an "ordination" with no implication of any defect in the ordination to the priesthood already received.

(b) It is more difficult to say what it is that supplemental ordination adds to the original ordination. The American statement spoke of "further grace of orders" and "authority"; Bishops Palmer and Western spoke of "Orders such as we Anglicans have inherited from the undivided Church", and, in other cases, "something more than an extension of jurisdiction". The Church of Scotland in 1944 accepted a report which spoke of "the conveyance of explicit authority to each already ordained presbyter 'for the wider exercise of his ministry under the new conditions', in the faith that God gives to His servants the grace which they need for any ministry to which they are called in His Church". But clearly it is almost impossible to *define* what can or should be added, or to justify the use of the term "ordination" for such addition.

(c) The difficulties are enhanced, however, by a further feature which is not always sufficiently noted, namely that the "agent" in such supplementing is assumed to be the Church, or its ministers. The minister of one Church lacks something which another Church can supply. The supplement is thus "conveyed through the action of the Church in and by which the rite is performed".⁴

The author himself notes this same assumption when on the next page he speaks of "this grace of willingness to recognize that which they lack, and this willingness to seek it from others." Or again in the Introduction: "If ordination is understood primarily as an act in which something is conferred by a Bishop or Presbytery upon the ordinand, then the idea of supplemental ordination is intelligible."⁵

The Swedish Church in South Africa had at one time lost the episcopal character of its ministry. When a new bishop became available he laid hands on the non-episcopally ordained ministers with the formula: "In accordance with the ancient rule of the Church and in furtherance of wider unity of Christian Churches, I now ratify the ordination previously given and bestow upon you the benefits of episcopal ordination to the priesthood." Or, in a proposal made to the Episcopal Church of North America before Lambeth 1948, we find the formula: "The ministry of the Word and Sacraments which thou hast already received is hereby recognized; and the grace and authority of Holy Orders as conferred by this Church are now added."

But perhaps the most logical carrying out of the idea is that recommended a few years ago in the organ of the Church Union in England, namely that unification should be achieved by each Church ordaining in its own way all the ministers of all the other uniting Churches.

Yet, while we may not reject altogether the need of a Church passing on its cherished traditions, the presumption that one divided Church is in a position to supply what is lacking in the ministry of another divided Church has no doubt contributed to the general rejection of the idea of supplemental ordination, although language suggesting the same idea continues to be used.

3. *The Lambeth Appendix of 1948*: A glance in passing at this appendix may now be worth while, particularly as the bishop has quoted from it.⁶ It is an unsatisfactory document, only intended to stimulate further inquiry and not to settle the issues or even to state them in any complete manner.⁷

The defence of supplemental ordination as given really refers only to the mere fact of the Church being divided, with the result that a commission to the ministry is given through only a part of the Church. "The most we can say, therefore, for any ministries in the divided Church is that they carry a commission conferred by Christ in and through part of His Body, but not the whole." It is admitted that the episcopate *ought* to be the ordaining organ of the whole Church, but "in fact it is not so". As it stands this appears to concern only the limits of authority, and not the differing character or tradition in the differing ministries. At one stage the North India Plan introduced this idea as a "common lack" due to our divisions; but this was soon discarded as inadequate and misleading. Where in the present Plan we say "their ministries are limited in scope and authority, not having the seal of the whole Church",⁸ more is intended than this mere fact of division. Presumably it is this something more which has led the Church of Scotland to re-ordain ministers of a Congregational Church—a fact which indicates that scruples may not be exclusively confined to Anglicans.⁹ It may be considered that a Congregational or Independent ordination, while expressing the call of God and appointment through a particular congregation, does not give sufficient assurance of that seal of the whole Church which is expressed in the action of a Presbytery or a Bishop.

While the defence of supplemental ordination is neither clear nor adequate, the other side of the argument begs the question, since it assumes throughout that in any ordination there is only one thing which can have been bestowed, "grace of ordination, the bestowal of the Apostolic commission". In this case there can be no more or less, nor can anything conceivable be added to what has been so bestowed. It is all or nothing, and on this view either ministries cannot be unified or they do not need to be.

At the same time the application of this theory to Bishops is left somewhat obscure. It is said, "A Bishop does not receive 'more' of the commission than a priest. He receives it for different purposes". This seems to imply that in the ordination of a Bishop the same "commission" is being repeated, though with a difference of purpose, which is a somewhat novel view of consecration.

The fact is, no doubt, that there is a "traditional" use of the term "ordination" which attaches it exclusively to the complete commissioning of the priest in the Church of God, apart altogether from considerations of the state of the ordinand or of that of the Church through which such ordination is being given. A Church is either competent to bestow such complete ordination or it is not; and a minister has either received it or he has not. Perhaps this view is the more natural where a Church recognizes but one order of ministry. But it is clear that Anglicans use the term "ordination" in a wider and looser sense, both in their Ordinal and elsewhere; and for a union of Churches with differing traditions of the ministry, such a narrow and exclusive interpretation would provide no basis.

4. *A restatement:* Actually it seems that in considering schemes for reunion there is general agreement about the fact from which the idea of supplemental ordination seems to start, namely that a ministry may be recognized as real, and yet in some respect be lacking, owing to our divisions. The Archbishop and Bishops in England, in commending to the Free Churches the appeal of Lambeth 1920, put this very clearly—"ministries which imply a sincere desire to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Churches concerned—are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. Yet ministries even when so regarded may be in varying degrees irregular or defective". I know that some who are foremost in maintaining in theory the authority of the episcopate would wish

to disown this statement; but it must be regarded now as common ground in the schemes of reunion which we are considering. That this is not just an Anglican peculiarity may be indicated by the fact that at the Council of Nicaea a not wholly dissimilar problem seems to have arisen over the bishops consecrated by Meletius in Egypt. The Council did not wish to deny that they were bishops, but their consecration had certainly been irregular, and something had to be done about it.

Further we must insist, as the Bishop recognizes, that ordination is the act of God in response to the prayer of his Church and through its ministers as his agents. It is not merely the act of the Church through some inherent authority vested in it and transmitted by human hands. Where there have been limitations it is not by a withholding of God's grace, but, as in revelation, through the hindrances interposed by weakness and sin whether in the individual or in the Church. A fuller recognition of this, and a study of the way in which it has steadily transformed the conception of unification both in the Ceylon Scheme and in the N.I.P. Plan, might have led the author to see that much of his criticism is completely beside the point.

We must also recognize that, when we speak of a defect or limitation in our ministries, due to our divisions, there is no one simple defect involved. Nor is it necessarily confined to the sphere of a minister's jurisdiction or to the reality of his ordination, which Bishop Newbigin appears to treat as exclusive alternatives.¹⁰ Suppose a minister has been ordained by an entirely independent congregation to its own ministry, with no thought of his relation to the whole Church whether in time or place. Can we deny the fact of a difference, as compared with an ordination in which the authority of the whole Church is fully expressed? There has been a limitation in the ordination; yet can we define just what has to be bestowed by God if such a difference is to be transcended in a united ministry? Even where we can point to an outward and visible difference, as in the presence or absence of the special link with the early episcopate through continuity of sees and a succession in the laying on of episcopal hands, can we define what inward and spiritual grace has to be added to those who happen to have been consecrated or ordained in separation from that line of continuity? Each Church has that which it treasures in its tradition of the ministry, and it would wish that to be clearly conserved

and included in the ministry of a united Church. Can that be guaranteed by the forms and wording of any rite, or must we not base our confidence on faith in God, trusting that in response to our prayer he, in whose purpose his Church is indeed one, can and will supply what he knows to be needed?

5. *Supplemental Ordination and the negotiations in C. and N.I.P.:* We must now consider, in the light of this discussion of the nature of supplemental ordination, whether the Bishop is right in alleging that the substance of the schemes in C. and N.I.P. is still a matter of supplemental ordination. Let us go back a little in history. On page 110 of his book he alleges that supplemental ordination "was commended with very great earnestness to the Joint Committee by the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon". He is evidently referring to the attempt made by Bishop Hubback to commend to those negotiating in South India the resolution of the General Council of C.I.B.C. in 1944. It was a strange example of a failure in communication (of which he himself was bitterly conscious) that others besides Bishop Newbigin were so convinced that what was being commended was supplemental ordination that they could not apparently hear what he was really trying to put across. The resolution ran, "we believe that when separated communions come together again, their ministries should be united by a solemn act of humility and re-dedication, in which through the mutual laying on of hands with prayer they seek from God the enrichment of all those ministries". Bishop Hubback wrote to me a year later, "you will remember that my plea was not for 'Supplemental Ordination' but for the mutual laying on of hands. It was the simultaneous arrival of Bishop Palmer and Western's proposal for supplemental ordination that caused the latter term to be adopted. It is a fact however that in our statement on the unification of ministries—the word 'supplemental ordination' was never mentioned. We all start from our confession of mutual defect due to our common sin of disunion. The mutual laying on of hands is the outward sign of our penitence and our prayer to God that He would repair as far as may be, our mutual defect. Supplemental ordination conveys the impression that we ordain (or consecrate) others and they do the same for us. That idea was not behind my plea; my idea, I hope, was that God will act, not through or by the authority of the Ordaining or Consecrating Person as He normally does, but by a

special and direct movement of His Grace for this particular set of circumstances."

The Joint Committee in South India rejected the plea; but it was taken up both in C. and in N.I.P., and led to the methods of unification there worked out. By the time of the Lambeth Conference of 1948, that conference could regard the Ceylon Scheme as free from the associations and defects of supplemental ordination. "There would be no use made of the phrase, and no implication of what is ordinarily meant by the idea, of 'supplemental ordination'. (See Appendix, page 64.) There would be a plain declaration of the intention to 'continue and reverently to use and esteem' the threefold ministry as it existed in the undivided Church, and to that end a recognition of the need for God, by the diverse operation of His Spirit, to supply in the case of each of the ministries concerned, whatever in the way of 'character, grace, gifts, and authority' they may in His sight require."¹¹ If the N.I.P. took longer to shake itself free from the implications of supplemental ordination (p. 55), it can surely claim both the intention of doing so and a considerable measure of success. It is strange that the Bishop should appear so blind to this whole development; and that, in spite of his quoting¹² the analysis made by Lambeth 1958 of the purposes of the method of unification in both schemes, he should still be under the fixed impression that the method is substantially that of supplemental ordination! It is really very far removed from that conception.

6. *Some obvious differences:* The Bishop claims that the Anglican Church is bound to define the services of unification as an episcopal ordination,¹³ and that therefore a priest of the Church of England, or indeed from any other episcopal Church, will be receiving episcopal ordination for a second time, and thereby either "concurring in an official denial of the reality of his own ordination in the Church of England, or else condoning a profanity". Has he never read the Scheme or the Plan, or has he really overlooked the statement given, with slight difference of wording, in both, "nor is it presumed to bestow again the grace, gifts, character or authority that have already been bestowed upon them"? ¹⁴

If we were dealing with a machine, say a mechanical washer, we should expect it to deal without discrimination with clothes of varying degrees of dirtiness and even with those that happened to be already clean! To a Church or a Bishop greater powers of discrimination have been given; but under the conception of

supplemental ordination they would be hard put to it to decide exactly with what intention hands should be laid on each minister coming to the rite. But need we be so lacking in faith as to think that God will be baffled by the problem and uncertain as to what is needed; that he would be so careless as to supply to a particular minister something which he had already given him on a previous occasion, or indeed that he should be open to our criticism if he dared so to do!? This is no mere "impatient retort";¹⁵ it is an appeal to that very principle of justification by faith and not by the works of any Church which the author has been urging us to recognize through his book.

But what of the Bishop's claim that the Anglican Church, if it is to give full recognition to the ministry of the united Church, is bound to declare that the unification rite is an episcopal ordination, and that the "prayers and formulae proposed for these rites are in all essentials those of an ordination service"?¹⁶ Is this true? Certainly no Anglican Church has yet made any such declaration, and, if we were so misguided as to do so, we should certainly be condemning our own priests to a repetition of their episcopal ordination. Nor would anyone carefully reading or hearing the terms of the Preface, Prayer, and Formulae be likely to confuse their intention with that of an ordination *de novo*. If by God's guidance further unions could be achieved in the future, the rites would be used, but with a reference and intention adapted to each new set of conditions, and with no mere mechanical repetition. Clearly where there is a further difference in the Church tradition of the ministry to be brought into the united Church, the rite is one which can significantly be used again for this new purpose. In this way also it differs from an ordination service.

No doubt, if we were still thinking in terms of supplemental ordination, we should have to think of an ex-Anglican Bishop in the rite performing an Anglican ordination, and a group of ex-Presbyterian ministers performing a Presbyterian ordination, and so on; so that the whole rite would be a medley of ordinations. Need it be said that this is not the intention? Ceylon indeed was careful to lay it down explicitly and clearly that "it is recognized that no name or title can be given to describe the nature of this service, as it has no historical precedent".¹⁷ Certainly no Ordination Service of any Church should be taken as a precedent.

But further the rite of Unification is not being performed by ministers of one divided Church for the benefit of those of others. It is an Act in which it is believed that God will work through the ministry of the united Church—in the Ceylon Scheme by the bishops who have already been commissioned as bishops of the Church of Lanka, and in the N.I.P. Plan by a bishop and two presbyters similarly commissioned for the purpose, whether in the Representative Act or in the Diocesan Services which follow.¹⁸

7. *Further issues:* It is surely a very different thing to believe that within the rite "episcopal ordination" will be bestowed by God if and where he sees that that is what is needed for the fullness of the ministry of the united Church: and that it will be received by those who are humbly and sincerely open to receive what God wills to give them for the good of his Church. The Anglican, thinking on the human level, believes that it is needed for the good of the Church, though within the Anglican Church there will be the different interpretations of this in terms of *esse*, *bene esse* or *plene esse*. In any case he will believe and intend that this gift which his Church has received and has treasured shall be shared in and through the rite of Unification, not merely to remove scruples, but for the carrying out of God's good purpose for the ministry of his Church.

No doubt in using the word "ordination" in this context the Anglican is employing it in the looser sense already noted and such usage may be open to misunderstanding on the part of those who insist on the more rigid interpretation of the word, in which it can only be performed once. What is essential in his thought is not so much any particular *act* of ordination, as the status of one who in his ministry is fully sharing in the historic ministry of the Church in the continuity of its episcopal ordering. That is the God-given treasure in the ministry he has received, recognized by himself and to be recognized by others so far as that is possible.

So in 1951 the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee of Theologians, reporting on the rite in the "C" Scheme, declared that "in our judgment Presbyters thus commissioned should be accepted by the Anglican Churches as duly commissioned and authorised for the same office in the Church of God as are their own priests." The Committee of Lambeth 1958¹⁹ stated that "from the Anglican point of view, therefore, the rite is intended to convey everything of value in the Anglican ministry, including the tradition of

episcopal ordination". The resolution of the General Council of the C.I.P.B.C. in 1960 puts the matter more directly and, perhaps, less guardedly, in saying, "In leaving it to the wisdom of God to determine what is to be bestowed on each participant, which we may expect to be different in each case, it is on the human level legitimate to place different interpretations upon what God does in the Act. Thus it is our conviction that in the rite episcopal ordination is bestowed upon those not previously so ordained, though it does not repeat any ordination previously received."

The C.I.P.B.C. in thus commending its action to Anglicans through this reference to "episcopal ordination" is expressing the conviction that for those who have shared in the rite there can no longer be discrimination between ministers episcopally ordained and those not episcopally ordained. Through God's gracious act and in answer to the prayers of his Church, all will share in the status which Anglicans expect of their own ministers. The fact that a bishop will take part in the laying on of hands in the rite makes it possible for an Anglican to think that God will use that instrumentality in the bestowing of this particular gift; but it does not compel anyone to accept such an interpretation. Nor should it imply that the bishop concerned must be careful to intend to ordain episcopally in certain cases and refrain from any such intention in others. His intention is to place himself in God's hands to be used as God wills, and he leaves the rest to God. Similarly the participant in the rite is not to be concerned with what in particular he or others may think he ought to be receiving. He too commits himself to God and intends to receive whatever of grace and authority it is God's will to bestow on him.

Returning for a moment to the rule laid down in the Anglican Ordinal, to which the Bishop refers, it is clearly important for us to know how it should be understood and interpreted. On the one hand what may be considered essential is the outward fact of a bishop's hands having been laid on the minister within a form of service recognized as an episcopal Ordination; on the other hand what may be considered essential is the character, grace, and authority given by God; and, while the episcopalian may believe that that is normally given by God through the outward rite, he need not believe that God himself is limited to the particular sacramental means, or that in the extraordinary circumstances of a union of ministries long divided God may not use other and

specially appropriate means. In a recent issue of the *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, Bishop Stephen Neill writes, "The words 'episcopal ordination' are part of the law of England, since they occur in the Preface to the Ordinal, which is itself a part of the Act of Uniformity of 1662. Presumably therefore these words have some precise legal significance in England; would an English court accept the Ceylon or North India ceremony as conferring episcopal ordination, in the sense in which the words have been traditionally used?" He suggests that it will be well to get this question answered. Perhaps this is so; but it will be for the Anglicans in England to determine whether they are to live under law or under grace in this matter, and to have their theological problems solved by theologians or by lawyers, by an Episcopal Synod or by a Privy Council. But by all means let the lawyers help us as well as the theologians.

We have, of course, been concerned here with the special aspect of securing the episcopal tradition in the united Church; but let it not be forgotten that this is but one aspect. The ministry of the united Church is to receive from God the enrichment which may come from the differing traditions and experience of the separated Churches. The minister of the C.I.P.B.C. is thus to receive what has been God's special gift to Methodist or Presbyterian or Baptist for the enrichment of his ministry in the united Church: the Anglican bishop is to share in the long tradition of the Methodist Episcopate. "We may surely trust that God will answer the prayers of his people and provide for the resultant Churches a ministry possessed of all the richness of inheritance which the uniting Churches previously treasured in separation."²⁰

In any such rite there are bound to be differing interpretations due to the very different backgrounds of thought in the separated Churches seeking to receive visible union. Such inevitable differences should be no obstacle to the carrying out of God's gracious purpose in giving what he sees to be needed, where such differences are not bare contradictions but are held within the fundamental unity of purpose—the purpose to continue and reverently use and esteem the threefold ministry in the united Church, and the intention of each participant to accept humbly from God what he is willing to give for the fulfilment of that purpose. Again our whole emphasis should be on the wholly unmerited grace of God, and our faith (and not our theological agreement) as the human

condition for reception. Greater theological agreement may surely follow after such a venture of faith, through the continued leading and bestowing of the Holy Spirit.

8. Lastly we should take notice briefly of what Bishop Newbigin has to say on the development of thought in the C.S.I., since this is not unconnected with our main concern in this somewhat critical review. As he reminds us the C.S.I. Basis recognized that there would continue to be in its ministry, at least for a time, some who had not been episcopally ordained, and the Pledge provides for any conscientious scruples held within the Church in regard to such ministers. At the end of the thirty year period the matter is to be reviewed, and it was laid down that "it is trusted that in its consideration of these matters (the Church) will give equal weight to the principle that there shall be a fully unified ministry within the Church, and to the no less fundamental principle that the united Church should maintain and extend full communion and fellowship with those Churches with which the uniting Churches now severally have such fellowship".

In the third section of his Introduction the Bishop now admits that there has already been a change here; and "the Church has a far more open door to the non-episcopal communions than the written text of the Basis of Union suggests". If he is right in his summary of these changes, it becomes clear not only that by the end of thirty years the Church will not be ready to make any final decision, but also that it will no longer be prepared to give that "equal weight" to the two principles laid down. The second principle is clearly becoming primary, and the first no more than secondary. Indeed it is suggested that the ministry in the C.S.I. is already so completely unified in spirit, that the fact that there are still some who conscientiously cannot accept sacramental ministrations from some of their clergy need not affect this spiritual unity. Such a view seems strangely similar to that of those who regard visible unity as unnecessary because we are already one in spirit—a view which the author has been so successful in demolishing in his book.

It may be that in any united Church such anomalies (which he claims need not be regarded as anomalies within a pilgrim Church on the move) are inevitable and for an indefinite future, if there is no other way of securing an accepted unification of the ministry. But, on the other hand, the admission, if it is correctly founded, is

likely to strengthen the endeavours of those who believe sincerely that there is another way open to us, which is not to be ruled out by the criticisms levelled against it in this introduction. It is an admission which is likely to reinforce the preference already shown by the Lambeth Conference for such an alternative method, and the hopes regarding it expressed in both the recent reports—*Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches*, and *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*.

¹ Lesslie Newbigin, S.C.M. 215.

² Op. cit., p. xx.

³ Ibid., p. xxv.

⁴ Ibid., p. 110.

⁵ Ibid., p. xxv.

⁶ Ibid., p. xxiv.

⁷ *The Lambeth Conference, 1948*, pp. 64-6.

⁸ *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*, pp.55-6, para. 11.

⁹ *The Reunion of the Church*, p. xxii.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. xxv.

¹¹ *The Lambeth Conference, 1948*, p. 56.

¹² *The Reunion of the Church*, p. xxi.

¹³ Ibid., xxiii.

¹⁴ *The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*, p. 56; *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*, p. 25.

¹⁵ *The Reunion of the Church*, p. xxiii.

¹⁶ Ibid., xxiv.

¹⁷ *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*, p. 23.

¹⁸ *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*, pp. 58, 59-60.

¹⁹ *The Lambeth Conference, 1958*, p. 2, 32.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 32.

REVIEWS

CALVIN, FRIAR JOHN—AND RELIGION

THE SCIENCE OF THE CROSS. By EDITH STEIN. (SR TERESA BENEDICTA OF THE CROSS, O.C.D.) Burns and Oates. 30s.

THE last twelve months have been noteworthy for those of us with any interest in the Spanish mystics. We have had Fr Crisogono's posthumous life of the Friar John, Professor Allison Peers' third volume, and now the book under review, from a distinguished Carmelite done to death in the German horror of Auschwitz. Of the present work, let it at once be said that for the Christian determined to come at what the Friar had to say of the way of the Cross, this book will remain for a long time an indispensable tool.

The book prompts a good deal of reflection. *Soli deo gloria!* Humanly, it is one of the tragedies of the Reformation period that Calvin never met John. For both were speaking of the same things, however varied their environment, and however diverse (at times) their language. Friar John draws precisely upon the same texts as Calvin; his dominant ideas and themes are the same, and for both men *the* fundamental heresy is idolatry. For both men it was more than that—it was sheer vice, and must issue in vicious living (in the most precise definition of that adjective). Those of us who had the delight of knowing Fr Herbert Kelly will recall how often he, too, repeated the Johannine phrase: "My little children, keep yourselves from idols." For John of the Cross, *the* purpose of the asceticism which he taught and practised was just this: to guard against the faintest possibility of there ever being the slightest confusion between God and any *image* whatsoever. Even our more "spiritual" ideas of the divinity must be utterly banished in the "dark night" of the soul. Man must be left without prop or stay, without even the insidious comfort of his own supposed "religious" experiences. Confuse mystical experience, however authentic, with God himself, and the very experience is a nightmare of error, a blasphemous untruth—an *idol*. Here lies the peril of "religion", of the kind of Christianity which says; "Hear Mass and frequent the confessional", and leaves theology (as John would have understood it) to the theologians.

But what is to be done with people, with the folk whom the self-conscious Gnostic termed the "earthy"? Are we suggesting Barth for Bethnal Green, and Calvin for Carling How? Not particularly—but we do emphasize the paramount importance of John of the Cross for the clergy in both places. It is not enough to get people to church, or talk of revivals of this and that—the nexus of the whole problem of the unchurched masses, if we would be faithful to them, is that we do not make an idol of "religion", make a high-place in men's souls where a lively cultus substitutes for the living, demanding God. The Protestant is as just as likely to do it as the Catholic, though the Catholic has in the last analysis less excuse. There has been a deal of talk of "liturgical

revivals" of one kind and another, and we fall over ourselves to imitate or assimilate the latest interpretation of the eucharistic, messianic Act. There is peril, as there has seldom been for many a year, that we strain at a very insignificant midge, and swallow a whole dromedary of misunderstanding. We—those of us who have to minister—are first called to the utter detachment which John, and Calvin, preached. This is not a call to proclaim the vocabulary of the saint from every pulpit—but it is a plea for awareness of what he was saying. The Wells organization, and E.M.C., are no effective substitute for teaching folk ejaculatory prayer, for example.

We have wandered a long way from Edith Stein's book—she prompts a good deal of profound heart-searching. Get it, read it, translate the technicalities of vocabulary into modern idiom—the result is not such as to bolster self-esteem. It speaks volumes for the detachment of the good Sister (and for Carmel) that this book was written in the shadow of advancing hordes in the Dark Years.

C. S. MANN

PROTESTANT HAGIOLOGY

PLAIN MR KNOX. By ELIZABETH WHITLEY. Skeffington. 25s.

IT IS necessary to warn the unwary reader that Mrs Whitley's book cannot be regarded as scientific history; it is rather an essay in the older hagiology or in hero-worship. John Knox by any standards was a great man and one does not grudge the author her admiration for him. But the Scotland of his day was not a *douce* community of the type familiar to the wife of the Minister of Edinburgh's High Kirk. One may recall the words of Maitland in the old Cambridge Modern History, where, speaking of the Scottish historians, he says:

They will also sufficiently warn us that the events of 1560 leave a great deal unchanged. Faith may be changed; works are much what they were, especially the works of the magnates. The blood-feud is no less a blood-feud because one family calls itself Catholic and another calls itself Protestant. The "band" is not less a "band" because it is styled a "Covenant" and makes free with holy names . . . What is new is that farsighted men all Europe over, not only at London and at Paris, but at Rome and at Geneva, should take interest in these barbarous deeds, this customary turmoil.

Even if one allows for the cynicism of an agnostic, no historian would question this. But Mrs Whitley seems unaware of it. The Lords of the Covenant are treated to some extent as drum and trumpet heroes, even if their faults are recognized; the whole history is regarded as a conflict between light and darkness. All this is perhaps not surprising when one finds that the book contains no single reference and no bibliography and that the principal source is clearly Knox's own *History of the Reformation of Religion* and letters. Nevertheless the

contrast is striking when one turns to other recent work, notably Dr Gordon Donaldson's scholarly *Scottish Reformation*. It is a pity, for the writing reveals a pleasant, humane, and enthusiastic temperament, sincere and religious. But other qualities of mind as well, at once more critical and more earthy, are called for from those who would explore successfully the mazes of sixteenth-century theology and politics in a society wild even by contemporary standards.

THOMAS M. PARKER

CANDID HISTORY

THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION. By GORDON DONALDSON. Cambridge University Press. 30s.

IT HAS been remarked wisely, with ecclesiastical controversies in view, that what Scotland needs is a purged memory. And that involves not merely a refusal to indulge in the ancient recriminations, but a candid reappraisal of the historical evidence in the light of thorough research by competent and judicious historians. Both those epithets apply with full force to Dr Gordon Donaldson; and it is relevant to quote here the verdict passed on a smaller book of his—*Scotland: Church and Nation through Sixteen Centuries*—by another distinguished historian, this year's Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr J. H. S. Burleigh: "Fascinating . . . the work of an expert who can in masterly fashion use a mass of detail to give actuality to the general movement of Scottish history".

The same qualities characterize this larger work. It is a splendid book, and the only matter for regret in connection with it is that it was not available before the recent series of Anglo-Presbyterian "Conversations" began. But the study of it should be regarded as a duty incumbent on all participants in any future discussions of the kind; and indeed on all Churchmen, whether Presbyterian or Anglican, who wish to be well informed on the relevant issues, and are not afraid of facing unpalatable facts.

And there are some unpalatable facts. It will be a shock to many Anglicans—if not to those who have read W. R. Foster's *Bishop and Presbytery*—to discover how little the Episcopalians of this period esteemed the Apostolic Succession, how low were their sacramental and liturgical standards, and how easily they fraternized with their fellow Scots; while the Presbyterian ranks may be shaken by the discovery that John Knox was no Presbyterian; that his farewell advice to the Church of Scotland was that it should have bishops; that in his time there was no thought of "parity of ministers", and that the genuine Presbyterianism which came later, with Melville, was "in no sense an indigenous Scottish movement".

"Presbytery and Episcopacy", writes Dr Donaldson, "are no doubt based on irreconcilable principles, . . . but if a reconciliation between

the two can be achieved, it was achieved in seventeenth century Scotland." Most of the history from 1575 to 1690 he regards as the record of "a series of attempts at compromise"; these attempts, and the events which led to the final victory of Presbyterianism in 1690, he traces in the most fascinating way and with the discerning candour of a Christian and truth-loving historian.

✠ ERIC GRAHAM

BAPTIST VIEW OF POWER

AUTHORITY AND POWER IN THE FREE CHURCH TRADITION. By PAUL M. HARRISON. Princeton University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 40s.

THIS is a heavily documented social case study of the American Baptist Convention; and the author's interest is evidently sociological. This, however, does not prevent his raising some theological issues of profound importance for Free Churchman in particular and for all Christians in general, who in the Ecumenical Movement are increasingly likely to have to deal with the problem of power.

Dr Harrison is a good deal under the influence of Max Weber's *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* and his views on the relationship between power and authority, though he qualifies Weber's theorizing by taking seriously Lasswell and Kaplan on *Power and Society*. Thus founded, he examines the structure and activities of the American Baptist Convention with extreme thoroughness. There can hardly be a relevant document he has not weighed; and the footnote "interview with sub-executive" (or associate secretary) is frequent. (What weight should be given to this sort of evidence may, of course, be questioned.)

We may suppose, therefore, that we have before us in this book adequate evidence of the way in which this Convention orders its affairs; and a fine nest of ecclesiastical and theological problems is disclosed. The American Baptists greatly stress the independence of the local congregation and are happy to describe their procedures as "democratic". While this often "works well" at the local level, it is manifestly hopeless to order a denomination of any size or to undertake a large-scale missionary enterprise without some organization. Accordingly a structure for the carrying out of these responsibilities has come into being; and it has been frequently declared that these denominational and missionary committees and boards have no authority; but inevitably they have acquired ever increasing power. The "executive" and those who work with him have to get things done. There is a great pressure towards efficiency. The result is that, while American Baptists accord to their organizations no authority whatever, they do in fact exercise great power. This, surely, calls for appropriate adjustment. It does not, of course, fall within Dr Harrison's scope to

deal with the solution of the problems he has laid bare; but that he has raised these issues cannot be denied.

Does this mean that churches of the independent type are being driven to admit that to operate on the scale now demanded of them qualifies drastically their cherished churchmanship? Can such churches develop out of their own ecclesiastical presuppositions an adequate relationship between power and authority? Or, will they have to become Presbyterian? This valuable social case study raises theological issues of no smaller importance than these.

JOHN HUXTABLE

MORALITY WITHOUT RELIGION

AN ANALYSIS OF MORALS. By JOHN HARTLAND-SWANN. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

IT IS a well-known fact that contemporary empiricism has by this time gone far beyond that narrow and circumscribed view of meaning associated with the name of logical positivism. Nowhere has this progress been more evident than in Moral Philosophy, where the broader empiricism has yielded many valuable insights into the logical complexity of the language.

Mr Hartland-Swann's book is a working exhibition of how a contemporary philosopher deals with the language of morals; how he distinguishes between the different behaviour of words within moral discourse, and hopes by this means to clear up many traditional misunderstandings. Early in the book, and again towards the end, he shows with good examples how moral judgements and decisions are far more complex than many traditional philosophers have supposed, and he makes some novel suggestions about the logic of moral discourse.

But on at least two points we may think that his analysis needs, and deserves, further development:

1. He argues that what makes an issue a specifically moral issue is that it should concern "socially important customs", but this, he hastens to say, is only an account of how we use the words. At the same time he is plainly gratified to think that the Navaho Indians, who at first sight might be thought to use ethical words differently, confirm his thesis (pp. 76-7). Does there still lurk something of Durkheim here? Is Hartland-Swann moving almost unnoticed from "explaining" to "stipulating", which at other times he is most anxious to distinguish?

2. Throughout the book, chiefly in certain asides, his distaste for religion becomes very evident. Why this dislike? My guess would be that in part it arises because he supposes that a religious person indulges "in some futile quest for 'absolutely' valid principles, or some 'unconditionally' valuable ends" (p. 184). But the religious man, with Mr Hartland-Swann, will talk of basic prescriptions, he will appeal to some way of life, and so on. Need the religious man's claims—however

unfortunately they may have been expressed in the past, however logically misleading their verbal form—be so very different then from what Mr Hartland-Swann suggests? That they are different may be granted, but *how* different we cannot tell without knowing much more than Mr Hartland-Swann tells us in his book as to what is involved in accepting a way of life as “appropriate”.

This is a stimulating book, clear and critical, written in a contemporary idiom, whose bite at many traditional moral theories is not unexpectedly severe, but whose occasional bark at religion need not be too forbidding. Certainly, the Christian philosopher can benefit as much as anyone else from that new approach to moral problems, that loosening up of moral thinking, which such a book encourages.

I. T. RAMSEY

ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN RELIGION

THE ANCIENT GODS. By E. O. JAMES. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 42s.

DR JAMES, by now the doyen of British scholars in this field, is the general editor of an ambitiously planned series on the history of religions. He is also the author of this, the first volume to appear. Its scope is indicated by its sub-title, “The History and Diffusion of Religion in the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean”.

The book is lavishly produced and well illustrated; and, as we have come to expect from the author, it is a thoroughly erudite survey. The adequate notes and bibliography make the book an invaluable work of reference as well as a conspectus of a field enriched every year by further archaeological discoveries. Dr James attempts no strikingly original theorization: he is content to consolidate known material and the more generally accepted recent views on the religions of the ancient world. Here and there perhaps he assumes as unquestionable things on which as yet there is still some doubt. For example, although most classical scholars tend to accept the general basis of Ventris’s decipherment of the Linear B script from Crete as an early form of Greek, by no means all do.

On the other hand, perhaps aware of a growing uncertainty that we may not understand ancient myth and liturgy quite so clearly as was once thought, Dr James rightly soft-pedals the ritual pattern theory as it was rather glibly expounded a generation ago. He also wisely avoids committing himself to the rash reconstruction by earlier scholars, such as Cumont, of the Hellenistic mysteries, notably Mithraism.

The first two chapters outline the rise of civilization and the emergence of religion in the ancient Near East. The next four deal in turn with the cult of the mother-goddess and her consort god, sacral kingship, the seasonal festivals, and the cult of the dead. The author then devotes a chapter to ancient cosmologies and another to divination, astrology, and prophecy.

The unique genius of the Hebrew prophets strangely enough receives scant mention, as does the religion of the early Greek philosophers. Possibly Dr James regards them as beyond the scope of his book. Like Christianity later, these inspirations and revelations are hardly fitted into what is, after all, an academic evolutionary framework. Nevertheless, all these sections present lucid, well-integrated outlines.

The last chapter is the least satisfactory. Rightly it indicates the highly complex and increasing syncretism of the ancient world from the fifth millenium B.C. up to the dawn of the Christian era; but the person of Christ and the institution of the Christian Church cannot adequately be disposed of under the heading of the blessed word "emergence". Nevertheless, this book is a fine example of scholarly industry; and if the subsequent volumes are of this quality the series will be a standard work for the next decade or two.

D. W. GUNDRY

POLITICAL ASSESSMENT

NATIONS AND EMPIRES: RECURRING PATTERNS IN THE POLITICAL ORDER.

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. Faber and Faber. 25s.

MY FIRST word must be an expression of profound admiration and congratulation. There was a time not so long ago when it seemed that Niebuhr's physical disabilities must seriously curtail his speaking and writing even if they did not prevent them altogether. But with immense courage and with all the ardour of his crusading spirit he has continued his work at Union Seminary and at the same time has succeeded in producing at least three books since his illness. Now he is about to retire, and the book under review will have been the last written during his actual professorial career. It is a worthy conclusion to one of the outstanding teaching ministries of this century.

What an amazing grasp of human history and of current political affairs Niebuhr possesses! As always he is deeply concerned about the world's present predicament, with the two great power-blocks confronting one another and with the intensity of smaller nationalisms constantly increasing. Are there any lessons from the past to guide our policies to-day? Niebuhr focuses attention upon the relation between nation and empire as revealed first in the ancient world, then in medieval Europe, and finally within the totality of peoples that has come into being since Europeans became world-explorers.

The first section on the ancient world contains interesting insights, but it seems to me that it is within the period starting roughly with St Augustine that Niebuhr begins to reveal his mastery of social history. From the sixteenth century onwards, he is completely in his element and his argument gathers momentum with all the force of the dialectic that we have come to associate with his teaching. The concluding analysis of the present world-situation is intensely sobering, and yet we

are never left with a sense of despair. There is no prospect of steering the ship of state into calm waters, but the Christian can set his confidence on realities which transcend the troubled situation encompassing his earthly career.

The titles of some of the chapters give a good idea of the scope of the book. "The Anatomy of Empire", "The Historical Basis for National Autonomy", "The Vague Universalism of Liberal Democracy", "The Utopian Basis of Soviet Power", "The Cold War and the Nuclear Dilemma"—these are some of the main themes in a brilliantly well-balanced argument. Niebuhr is not blind to elements of Communist strength and of his own country's weakness. He pours his scorn upon utopian illusions and upon imperialistic hypocrisies. Even more he denounces power-hungry despotisms and machine-like totalitarianisms. The pearl of great price is human freedom—though men's pretension "that they are more free of finite conditions than mortals can be generates destructiveness amidst the creativity of freedom. Our best hope, both of a tolerable political harmony and of an inner peace, rests upon our ability to observe the limits of human freedom even while we responsibly exploit its creative possibilities."

Niebuhr does not obtrude his theology, but in one or two striking passages he leaves us in no doubt that it is the figure of Christ which provides him both with the central symbol of the frame of meaning for life and with the final judgement on all humanistic pretensions, individual or corporate. I found myself wondering at times whether sufficient weight was being given in the course of the argument to sheer biological and economic considerations in the human situation. But all in all I believe Niebuhr's exposition to be forceful and convincing. One could only wish that politicians as well as religious leaders could learn wisdom from his teaching.

F. W. DILLISTONE

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

ST IGNATIUS AND CHRISTIANITY IN ANTIOCH. By VIRGINIA CORWIN. Yale University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 40s.

IGNATIUS was not the neurotic that Streeter thought him to be. He may have been excitable, but he was on his way to face the beasts in the arena and his guards were already behaving like leopards. One is hardly likely to be in the most equable of moods at such a time. Essentially he was a devout, clear-headed, practically-minded bishop, although inclined to magnify his office.

Dr Corwin gives us the most careful and balanced account we have had of the subject in recent times. She regards Ignatius as steering a middle course between the Scylla of Docetism and the Charybdis of Essene Christianity. She scouts the suggestion that he was essentially Gnostic. His nearest affinities are with the Fourth Gospel and the Odes

of Solomon, though he is more tied to history than either. This is to do less than justice to the Fourth Gospel, but Dr Corwin does not feel the intensity of the Johannine author's attack on the Docetic elements in his environment.

Ignatius' real aim was the mystic's union with God. This could only be attained as the tendency to division in the self and in the Church was overcome. Help was to be found in a thorough-going *mystique* not only of the sacraments but of martyrdom. Hence the theological originality that peeps through his hastily written but most moving letters.

This is a learned and admirable study. There are ten pages of bibliography.

W.W.

HOLY LIVING

THE PIETY OF JEREMY TAYLOR. By H. TREVOR HUGHES. Macmillan. 25s.

DEAN FARRER set *Holy Living and Holy Dying* above the *Theologia Germanica*, the *Imitation of Christ*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. That is high praise indeed, and if Trevor Hughes cannot go quite so far he at least says of the author that "it would be hard to find anyone to whom the pastoral office meant more or graced it with greater devotion".

It is intriguing to find a Methodist writing with such evident appreciation of one of our great Caroline divines. Our satisfaction is all the greater because his treatise is no mere piece of hagiology, but a neat, critical examination of the relevant literature in the best academic style. Like his author he indulges in no extravagant flight of rhetoric but is equally ready, while keeping soberly to the ground, to grace a sentence with a nice simile or lighten it with an apt analogy. It is perhaps because he feels that, in spite of all qualifications, Taylor was at heart a sacerdotalist that he cannot let his enthusiasm for his subject achieve more vehement expression. But he does submit him to a rigorous, if sympathetic, scrutiny, and that is what we needed.

There are some amusing misprints: "Green" for "Greek" on p. 61, a "than" omitted on p. 159, and the odd word "presumptuous" on p. 102.

W.W.

RELIGION AND LITERATURE

THE BORDERLAND. By ROGER LLOYD. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

CENTURIES. By THOMAS TRAHERNE. Faith Press. 15s.

CANON LLOYD'S starting point is the need the theologian has of someone to popularize his work. He is the "servant of truth"; his popularizer must be "a free and independent artist", whose "first

servitude is to delight". To this he will be bound by "vocation from God". The book is called *The Borderland* because it is a study of the transition from theology to literature, from prophecy to poetry, from mysticism to inspiration. It collects relevant examples of creative activity from many sources, of which a passage from *Robinson Crusoe* and another from *Tom Brown's Schooldays* are among the best. In the main however Canon Lloyd avoids familiar authors and produces some striking extracts which will be new to many readers. He has contented himself with quoting one hymn ("At the Name of Jesus") when many would have illustrated his point. His determination not to make any hard and fast distinction between religious and secular inspiration is valuable, but pressed to conclusion it results in this about authors: "If a man were to use his art to make war on the whole Kingdom of God, he would be just as fully subject to inspiration as the man who dedicated his skill to defend and spread it." Each would be "haunted by the Muse", Canon Lloyd says, in one of a number of arresting phrases in the book, which is easy to read and will put new and fruitful ideas into many minds.

It is not irrelevant to consider side by side with *The Borderland* this new edition of Traherne's *Centuries*, which in its modernized form is a purely religious writing in quite ordinary language. Traherne seems to some extent to have been able to obliterate the borderland between divinity and literature. Some will find him prolix, but otherwise it is impossible not to praise him. He is truly religious, and his language is without affectation. His professed purpose is to promote our happiness, or, to use his own word, our "felicity", and he has succeeded in his aim over and over again. To have the *Centuries* in a plain, convenient, and seemly edition puts us in debt to the Faith Press. H. M. Margoliouth, whose death we all deplore, writes a prefatory Note of three pages, and Hilda Vaughan contributes an enthusiastic Introduction of which one's only complaint is that none was needed.

ADAM FOX

GORE'S THEOLOGY

GORE: A STUDY IN LIBERAL CATHOLIC THOUGHT. By JAMES CARPENTER. Faith Press. 30s.

A YOUNG American priest has devoted several years to the production of this comprehensive study of the ideas of Charles Gore and of what Gore himself called Liberal or Scriptural Catholicism. A long list of Gore's works and a tremendous Bibliography are appended. Mr Carpenter has done his job well: he is very objective and it is rather tantalizing to remain uncertain what he himself believes. Criticisms of Gore are plentiful, both quoted from others and made by the author himself, but they are always fair and objective. The sizing up of the Man and his Manner is almost uncannily accurate for one who did not

know his subject personally. For instance, Gore was seldom capable of fully sympathizing with opponents' views, nor was there any essential change in his own in fifty years. His attempts to combat error by the sheer exercise of authority were doomed to failure. So eminent a critic as Paul Elmer More remarked that Gore and the *Lux Mundi* group took up more truly than did the Tractarians the thread of continuity from the Carolines. Perhaps the most original part of Mr Carpenter's book is the very full study of Gore's view of authority, about which Dom Chapman said: "For Gore, Church authority is not a present fact, but the historical witness of a dead church of ages ago."

In favour of the orthodoxy of Gore's Christology it may be said that he has not only been accused of Nestorianism but also of the equivalent of Eutychianism. Further Mr Carpenter wisely remarks: "The impetus towards docetic conceptions lurks in the pulpits and pews of every Church in the Catholic tradition."

With Gore a new emphasis on Christ's priestly office in heaven and its representation on earth in the Eucharist began in Anglicanism.

This book has too many misprints, the worst being "God" for "Gore". The index is inadequate.

FREDERIC HOOD

APPLIED THEOLOGY

ON BEING THE CHURCH IN THE WORLD. By JOHN A. T. ROBINSON. S.C.M. 16s.

THE Bishop of Woolwich has collected in this book fifteen lectures and addresses. Most of them belong to his time as Dean of Clare College, Cambridge. There is a link between them all. They discuss the relation between the body of Christ and the body of this world, the body politic. They represent the Bishop's thinking on "applied" rather than pure theology. They show the bearing of three contemporary movements of importance—biblical theology, liturgical reform, and the ecumenical movement.

There is a lecture on the Christian doctrine of power which is in every way stimulating. It would be hard to find a better position of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body than that which the Bishop gives in his lecture on matter. The address on the Gospel and health is on the same level. One is grateful for the exposition of the difficult doctrines of death, judgement, and the second coming.

The Bishop's views on concelebration and the doctrine of episcopacy are well ahead of contemporary thinking. They raise practical questions which need elucidation. But throughout the book the Bishop shows both careful attention to biblical theology and also concern with the actual situation in which the Church's work must be done to-day.

MARCUS KNIGHT

THE QUEST OF FAITH

FAITH AND THE MOUNTAIN. By NOEL BONAVIA-HUNT. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

THIS book is interesting, as the author is aware of many relevant intellectual questions. It is less successful in that it is written in novel form, and the characters involved remain puppets. The hero is a young Oxford graduate with intellectual difficulties about belief. He goes about seeking wisdom from a biologist, a philosopher, a psychologist, and a student of psychic research. Finally he reaches faith through conversation with a sympathetic and understanding priest.

The questions raised are those which perplex the reflective mind. They concern man and his destiny, and the meaning of his existence. The summaries of positions which claim assent apart from Christian beliefs are useful. It is refreshing to find serious consideration given to paranormal aspects of experience. But in some ways the whole discussion has a flavour of the situation between the wars rather than in the modern world. Does the shoe to-day pinch at the points where Mr Bonavia-Hunt is sensitive?

His commendation of the need of silence and meditation is valuable. There is much in this book which could be helpful for discussion groups and teaching sermons.

MARCUS KNIGHT

DISCOVERY OF SPIRITS

RELIGIOUS AFFECTIONS. By JONATHAN EDWARDS, edited by JOHN E. SMITH. Yale University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 60s.

AMONGST the early religious leaders of New England Jonathan Edwards stands out pre-eminently as preacher, writer, and theologian. Not since 1874, however, has a collected edition of his works been printed, and it is not surprising that as part of the splendend historical reconstruction of the pattern of life and thought in early New England which is now in progress in the U.S.A. a new edition should have been planned. Perry Miller, the general editor, has enlisted the help of a distinguished team of scholars and two major books have now been published, *The Freedom of the Will*, by Paul Ramsey of Princeton, and now *Religious Affections*, by John E. Smith of Yale. One hardly needs to say that the printing, format, textual apparatus, and historical introduction attain a very high standard. But is such a book of value to any outside the limited circle of historians of ideas?

The editor claims that this eighteenth-century treatise about Religious Affections is of perennial interest beyond any such limited circle because it tackles fundamental questions in a definitive way. Every age has to grapple with the problem of the marks which distinguish true religion from false. Or to put it in the way which was specially pressing in Edwards' day: "How can the presence of the Divine Spirit (in

contrast to the Satanic spirit of falsehood) be discerned?" Edwards dealt with these questions on the grand scale and in a spirit in which careful reasoning and reverent imagining were admirably combined. As his editor points out, in his writings doctrine and style flow together. He was convinced that religion has to do with the "affections" and that in consequence clear thinking and "affecting" speech must constantly be held together. Information and inspiration are both to be found in his long exposition of the twelve signs which distinguish the gracious affections as having been wrought by the Spirit of God himself.

Yet although Edwards was dealing with fundamental questions which still demand answers in the religious situation of our own day, it is difficult to think that his treatment can throw much light on our modern problems. And this for two reasons. On the one hand our own appeal to Scripture must be so different from that of Edwards' that much of his argument loses its force. On the other hand our view of the human psyche has been so influenced by the revolution in psychological theory which has taken place in the last 50 years that Edwards' analysis often seems unconvincing or even meaningless. This is not to say that Edwards' treatment of Scripture is wooden—rather there is a depth of sympathy with the writers of Scripture which is often impressive: and his psychological insight is remarkable within its context. But we still cannot deal adequately with so fundamental a question as the difference between true and false religion unless we draw upon all the resources that modern historical and scientific studies have made available for us.

For the valuable light it sheds on the religion of eighteenth-century New England and for the attractive picture it presents of an outstanding theologian of the time, this book is to be highly commended. Whether it can give helpful guidance to the twentieth-century Christian facing problems similar to those of Edwards' time is another question.

F. W. DILLISTONE

PARENTHOOD AND POPULATION

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION AND CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY. By RICHARD M. FAGLEY. Oxford University Press. 28s.

UNTIL recently, Christians as a whole have shown but slight interest in the population problem as such, and the churches have been slow to formulate policies or to press for government action. For Anglicans, however, the Warren Report presented the demographic situation and its social, economic, and moral implications, as a challenge which could no longer be ignored; and the Lambeth Conference of 1958 met this challenge in a realistic and constructive spirit which has been widely (and justly) commended as marking a significant advance in Christian thought. The statistical sections of the Warren Report, though masterly in their presentation of detail, were necessarily restricted to selected

areas and related to the special task of the Lambeth Conference Committee on The Family in Contemporary Society. In order to see the problem in its full dimensions a broader treatment is needed, topical in plan rather than regional—and this Dr Fagley provides in his analysis of what has now become known as the “population explosion”.

He states clearly in the Preface that this is not a book for the student or the specialist, but a “memorandum” addressed to those who wish to know the facts and the implications of the rapidly accelerating growth in world population, and designed to stimulate a concern which will find expression in immediate action. It is not, as the title indicates, simply a manual of demography. Dr Fagley’s real aim is to show that the only satisfactory answer to the problem of population pressure is a Christian doctrine of responsible parenthood—and it is with this that the later part of the book is concerned.

The first five chapters discuss the demographic facts, the causes and consequences of over-population, the effect of migration, the food situation, and the economic aspect of the problem. A brief consideration of population policies, and of the various expedients employed in different parts of the world to control the size of the family, forms a bridge to the second section, in which Dr Fagley surveys religious and theological attitudes to parenthood. He gathers together at the end an impressive volume of evidence to show that in the non-Roman Churches of the West co-operating in the ecumenical movement “a fundamental consensus of conviction on responsible parenthood is rapidly evolving”—and that this consensus includes acceptance of contraception as a morally and theologically legitimate means of family planning.

In an appendix Dr Fagley prints the Report of an international study group on “Responsible Parenthood and the Population Problem” which met at Mansfield College, Oxford, in April 1959. Convened under the auspices of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, the findings of this conference show the extent of this emerging consensus. But if successive reports mark the evolution of this consensus, the author makes it clear that it is by the work of individual theologians that the foundations have been laid—and that on both the personal and the corporate level, Anglicans have played an important part. Dr Fagley adds his own contribution in the concluding pages by suggesting the points upon which there is a significant convergence of agreement.

These are: that Man is more than nature, for his freedom lifts coition into the realm of ethical decision; that grace (which transforms rather than perfects nature) is necessary for right ethical decision: that the primary purpose of marriage (which is “a precondition for the right use of sex”) is to glorify and serve God through the perfecting of the one-flesh union; that procreation is neither the chief purpose of marriage, nor the essential purpose of coition; that in family planning,

motive and not method is the primary moral issue; and that contraceptive methods cannot be ranged according to any *a priori* grading. But this convergence does not mean that everything is virtually settled. There are many points which need further study and clarification; and always in the background of the discussion, growing ever more and more insistent, is the demographic problem which is already acute in many under-developed areas.

The theological issue is of more than academic or personal interest. Dr Fagley calls non-Roman Christians to penitence for a *laissez-faire* attitude in the past which has been a major factor in government inaction and neglect. Failure to present a positive alternative to Roman Catholic condemnation of contraception has meant, in fact, an exaggerated and crippling deference to Roman opinion on the part both of states and of bodies like the United Nations and the World Health Organizations. The effect of this upon the volume and nature of the aid given to over-populated areas has probably been considerable, and Dr Fagley does not hesitate to pronounce a judgement which is given weight by his own considerable knowledge and experience of world affairs gained in the service of the World Council of Churches. He is guardedly critical, too, of the apparent lack of awareness by the World Council itself of the pressing nature of the population problem—at least until recently; and in this connection he makes a valuable point. Responsible Christian parenthood comes ultimately from a theology of marriage and the family—yet despite the raising of hopes from time to time, the World Council has not yet established what would seem to be essential to its work and witness: a department concerned with sex and marriage. That on the Co-operation of Men and Women in Church and Society was a step in the right direction; but many felt at the time of its formation that the World Council should have gone the whole way. The issues involved ought never to have been regarded as simply denominational or confessional, and it is to be hoped that their relevance to the population explosion will lead before long to appropriate action.

It remains to commend Dr Fagley's book as a valuable survey of the demographic and theological aspects of one of the greatest and most neglected problems of our time. Not the least of its merits is that it is a well-informed and readable presentation of a subject which could, in other hands, have been tedious. Concern for his cause illuminates the statistics, and Dr Fagley leaves the reader with a clear challenge, and the conviction that in some parts at least of the Church a great theological adventure is in progress.

SHERWIN BAILEY

INFLUENCE OF SAINTS

SAINTS OF RUSSIA. By CONSTANTIN DE GRUNWALD, translated by ROGER CAPEL. Hutchinson. 25s.

THIS book has a special purpose, beyond the general one of edification. It is to refute the opinion that "neither by the originality of their character or achievements, still less by their influence on history or civilization can the saints of Russia be equated with the saints of the Latin Church". So the Saints of Russia in this book are described in terms, not only of personal character, but of their influence upon the world in which they lived. The carefully selected ten are Vladimir, Boris and Gleb, Theodosius, Alexander Nevsky, Sergius of Radonezh, Nil Sorsky, Philip of Moscow, Tikhon of Zadonsk, and Serafim of Sarov. Thus the light is flashed for us upon critical moments in nearly a thousand years of Russian history. The studies are all well done. But many western readers will turn with special interest to the story of the two mysterious brothers Boris and Gleb, those eleventh-century exponents of the doctrine of non-resistance whose icon appears on the jacket of this book as well as forming its frontispiece. Wherein exactly did their sainthood consist? The question of personal piety hardly arises: but they submitted without resistance to being murdered by their brother who coveted the small cities of their patrimony. Their action left a deep impress upon the Russian religious mind.

For full measure the book is furnished with an excellent Epilogue. It contains a brief but valuable account of the *starets* and his function in the spiritual life of the Russian people. Paissy Velitchkovsky, the eighteenth-century translator of the Greek Philocalia into the Slavonic Dobrotolybuie is given his place in the revival of *starchestvo* in modern times. He is followed by the great nineteenth-century *Startsi* of Optina, figures of commanding influence at all levels of society, whose personalities are reflected in *The Brothers Karamazov* and other Russian novels.

The translation (made perhaps from a French version?) is adequate, if at times it gets a little turgid. It is rather disconcerting to the reader to find "*starets*" used as a plural; and he may well feel that he might have been spared such a word as "Slavonicization".

R. M. FRENCH

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN GERMAN SCHOOLS

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN GERMAN SCHOOLS. By ERNST CHRISTIAN HELMREICH. Harvard University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 60s.

THIS is an historical approach to the whole subject of the provision of religious education in German schools. The author writes for

American readers. However, anyone interested in the history of the provision of religious education in any country will greatly profit by reading this book. Forgetting a few "Americanisms" and its reference to theologians as theologues the book is most readable.

It is well provided with sections relating to its Contents, Bibliography, Notes in profusion, and Index. From the student's point of view these are invaluable.

Every phase of the possible relationship between Church and State in religious education is illustrated in connection with German Schools. Equally the problems of satisfying the needs of religious communities is fully set out. In Germany the problem has always been exacerbated by the power of all the States. Not until there was a strong central direction were the local problems overcome. Later, under the Nazis, the strong central direction was completely overpowering. More recently in East Berlin and under the Democratic Republic a form of religious education is tolerated but discouraged. Elsewhere, however, the experience of the ages is being used. Not only are there Confessional Schools, whose strength has always greatly withstood the wrong use of the State's power, but also interdenominational schools which are completely encouraged.

Indeed, many of the problems which have been faced and are being faced in Britain in regard to the provision of religious education have been faced at an earlier date in Germany. All sections of the religious communities now require religious tests for teachers giving Religious Instruction but no teacher is obliged to give such Instruction. Where this is not possible, the churches have spared no pains in training lay catechists who visit schools. The problem of the shortage of teachers has been faced over and over again in Germany. However, in this respect it would seem that the training of teachers has not been as advanced as one would have expected, and the churches rather neglected this most important aspect in the provision of religious instruction. For this reason many of the anti-religious movements have gained a hold in the schools owing to the co-operation of the teachers.

The content and method of Religious Education through the ages is fully discussed. It is shown by Dr Helmreich that the necessity and desire for Religious Education was a natural consequence of the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers. In addition, since the last war, churchmen have determined that never again should the State be permitted to have a commanding influence over Religious Instruction. This will undoubtedly bear fruit in the years to come.

Religious teaching for children is wanted by the German people. Even though bereft of their leaders and teachers, the churches are responding. It is hoped that all teachers giving Religious Instruction in schools, although visiting a number for the purpose, will have recognition in a local congregation. Could it be that the Scripture specialists in our own schools should have a similar recognition as well as being regarded as members of a school staff?

L. B. TIRRELL

RECRUITING A MINISTRY

ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS: CHURCH AND MINISTRY. By F. R. BARRY.
 Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

THIS is a frustrating and urgent book. It poses one question after another until the reader is exhausted by asking himself how and when, or if ever, the questions could be answered effectively. No part of the book is more true than that which says a revolution will be needed if the content of the book is to be followed up. But that depends upon how long we must wait. Speedy action in response to these questions would indeed be like a revolution. But we must not be deceived by the obvious desire of the Bishop to get things done quickly. Much is already being done and all his questions are not being overlooked. But the Bishop thinks it is being done in bits and pieces, and his plea is for concerted action. He would like to see a re-shaping of much of the Church's work. But who is to decide upon the form of it and see that it is carried through? He would like to see great changes in the training given to ordinands. But would the theological college principals support him? Would his brother bishops agree? And who will determine the "More rigorous standard of selection and qualification than we now have" for the parson of to-morrow?

Bishop Barry has probably done more than any man now living to keep before the Church the need to think and do something about vocation to the ministry. In this book he asks questions about vocation in its widest sense. In short he asks, What is the Church supposed to be doing? There is an urgency about his questions—a now or never attitude—which makes the book a moving appeal to take stock of ourselves by giving careful thought to these questions. And if we agree with them, the bishop asks us whether we shall be able to face up to the scrutiny and the changes which his questions imply.

✠ PHILIP WHITBY

THE ROLL OF HONOUR

THE GLORIOUS COMPANY. By FREDERICK C. GILL. Epworth Press. 15s.

WHAT is the connection between Salome and Nicholas Ridley? Or between Elfleda of Glastonbury and Richard Cadbury? The answer is: both the former occur on October 22nd and the latter on October 23rd in Fredrick Gill's daily readings.

But there is also the further connection that all these people and the nearly three hundred others in *The Glorious Company* have played a vital part in the Christian story and enrich for us our heritage in the Communion of Saints.

This book, the second volume, covers July to December. It takes courage to embark on "Lives of Great Christians" nowadays since the subject has had much attention. But the author's bravery is more than

matched by his ability. Written with the art that conceals art, the very quality of the book is the only justification it needs.

To that quality of closely worked but palatable facts is added an impressive catholicity. Frederick Gill has wandered down the streets of the centuries and stopped to chat with all and sundry. He has then come back home and introduced them to us in such a way that they become our friends too.

If you already have volume one you will naturally buy this one. If this one is your first encounter with the author you will find yourself wanting volume one. They are books which will collect not dust on your shelves but the patina of constant use.

DEWI MORGAN

METHODIST PASTORALIA

THEOLOGY AND THE CURE OF SOULS. AN INTRODUCTION TO PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By FREDERIC GREEVES. Epworth Press. 22s. 6d.

THIS volume is the work of a leading minister of the Methodist Church. He was on circuit for many years, and is now Principal of Didsbury College, Bristol. The book consists of four parts. The first part defines pastoral care as the task of shepherding and building up the faithful within the Church, and indicates the general importance of theology in this connection. Throughout the book, the author emphasizes that pastoral care cannot be left to the ordained ministers; it is "the Church's responsibility for mutual help in discovering the meaning and the implications of the new life in Christ".

The second part starts with doctrine, and proceeds to pastoral care. The author considers the doctrines of the Trinity, of full salvation, and of the Church, and shows their importance for pastoral work to-day. The doctrine of full salvation is taken to include justification and sanctification, perfect love, and assurance. Part three starts with pastoral experience and proceeds to theology. It discusses popular misconceptions and their correction, the nature and treatment of sin, and divine providence in relation to human life and death. The last part deals with the duty of ministry and its fulfilment: first by the whole Church, then by the professional minister, and finally by the theologian.

In these chapters, the author presents a series of stimulating and suggestive studies for the benefit of Methodist ministers and lay workers. But he includes so many important subjects that he is unable to provide a thorough treatment for any one of them. For example, in the chapter on the doctrine of the Trinity, there is no mention of Athanasius or of the Cappadocians, and no reference to the decisions reached at Nicaea and Constantinople; in short, there is no indication that the Church was led to formulate and define this doctrine in order to safeguard the reality of the redemption mediated by Jesus Christ.

G. J. INGLIS

FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST

IS ANYONE THERE? By J. TREVOR DAVIES. Independent Press. 10s. 6d.

THE author of these sermons has as his *leitmotif* the experience of fellowship with Christ. This, he tells us, is the essence of religion, as the test of its reality is a humble life of service and imitation of Christ. He does his utmost to show the relevance of this to the contemporary scene. He does not, however, define "experience", nor relate it to the intellectual and institutional elements in religion. He further surprises us by putting the mystics out of court as helpers of the uninitiated—"their own assurance", he says "is far too personal and subjective to aid those who have no eyes to see the unseen". He has quoted Shelley and John Donne—and then goes on to quote St Paul, a practical mystic if ever there was one.

"A Debt of Honour", one of the best sermons here, seems to rest on a wrong exegesis of the text, "I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians", which merely means, "I am under an obligation to preach the Gospel to them". However, this and the following sermons are the best in the book.

This preacher is so zealous to be rightly relevant to the present age that it is unfortunate he should retain many stylistic archaisms—"I have declared unto you", "Aye", "Nay", "Think you?", "'tis"—which even regular churchgoers (for whom these sermons are primarily intended) must find a little quaint.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

IMAGINATION

THE CREATIVE IMAGINATION. By KENNETH C. BARNES. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d.

THE author is a member of the Society of Friends (he dislikes "Quaker"), an experienced schoolmaster, and a scientist. After an opening chapter on the meaning of imagination, he argues that imagination is essential to science; for the scientist must be a man who can dream dreams and imagine ideas and patterns that are not given in the facts he observes. He then applies his plea for disciplined imagination to the story of Jesus and to the Incarnation. After showing how he thinks organized Christianity has discouraged imagination ("Religion in Fetters"), he pleads for humility, for involvement in the world as a world not to escape from but to accept, and for a faith which springs from imagination, sympathy, and experience and which to some extent is prepared to abandon certainty and security.

This is a stimulating essay and one cannot fail to be impressed by the author's devotion and compassion and by his concern that we should not fear science as a threat to religion and culture, but should use it as a means through which we can be emancipated from obsession

with the evil and potential dangers in the world and so be alive to its beauty and adventurous opportunities. But Mr Barnes' criticisms are disappointing. He does not reveal a clear understanding of orthodox Anglican teaching and his criticism of organized Christianity would carry more weight if he had given something on the credit side.

But the book will repay reading because of its main theme. Lack of imagination is a serious fault, as Dick Sheppard used to remind us when he described it as "Seeing the picture behind". Mr Barnes makes good use of quotations from Shaw's *St Joan*, especially the warning, "Must then a Christ perish in torment in every age to save those who have no imagination?"

✠ GEORGE WILLESSEN

SUPPLEMENTARY MINISTRIES

PART-TIME PRIESTS? Edited by ROBIN DENNISTON. Skeffington. 15s.

THIS book is timely and the editor is to be congratulated on gathering together contributions which cover practically every aspect of the subject. He himself provides an excellent epilogue in which he summarizes the views expressed, the principles involved, and the questions which have to be asked; and readers may be well advised to read this first.

In the first section, "Theory and Practice", Dr Barry convincingly states the case for supplementary ministries, the late Bishop of Bath and Wells examines some of the difficulties, and the Archbishop of York gives us two pages of fresh air—and hope: "There will be, somewhere, the first part-time priest in the sense which this book attaches to the word; and there will be the bishop who ordains him. . . It remains to remove as soon as possible whatever legal and canonical barriers exist, and for someone to act upon what he believes to be right." There follow eight contributions "opening up the subject" from every angle, including historical and legal considerations and an account of supplementary ministries in the Roman Church and of Eldership in the Church of Scotland. The Bishop of Michigan's article is outstanding. He deplores the inadequacy of the Lambeth report on ministries and man-power, "The only form of man-power that Anglicanism really cares about is the parish priest." Even here "there is a fundamental weakness in a one-soldier army (a lone Vicar ministering to a parish) which we have never recognized", and two truths show this weakness, "to be human is to be limited" and "because souls differ, different souls appeal to different people". The Rural Dean of Islington describes the training and proper use of the laity and thus emphasizes "the ministerial responsibility to the whole Church". "For too long the laity of the Church of England have expected to be fed and comforted by their clergy, but never to be challenged, trained and equipped to speak for Christ in open witness in the parish and the world". A third

section deals with "experience and ideas", and here a great variety of priests and laymen give their personal reactions to the question. Thus the Reverend T. Bickersteth, who worked for a fortnight in a factory in his parish ("far too short, I fully realize"), pleads "not for workmen turned priests but priests turned workmen" and reminds us that "the first duty of an insurance clerk who takes Holy Orders is to be a good insurance clerk". Mr George Goyder would like to see the P.C.C. "acting as an administrative body on behalf of the Laos rather than as the rubber stamp for the Church official it so often is". The editor of *Prism* and a university lecturer write of the tensions which arise from combining their special disciplines with the duties laid on them as believing and practising Christians. This is an extremely interesting and thought-provoking section.

Several things become quite clear from this varied collection of essays. The time is ripe for experiment in supplementary ministries, and yet we must avoid the mistake of thinking that these will solve the appalling overall shortage in the Ministry; there is no such error in this book. But the editor is surely too optimistic when he says that the presuppositions from which discussion arises are "fairly generally accepted". Is there yet a body of opinion which will demand something bolder and more courageous than the Lambeth report gave us? Secondly, the ambiguity and prejudice caused by "full-time" and "part-time" must be cleared up. "Ordination", as the editor says, "involves particular gifts and inevitable tensions *vis-à-vis* relating the sacred with the secular", and "there must be a breakdown of the barrier between the sacred and secular, and a categorical assertion of the Church's *this-worldly* task." But what are we to say when we find a bishop writing, (p. 18) "to use the present Ordinal for part-time and supplementary priests who would continue to pursue a secular occupation would be rather like using the present marriage service for those who have former partners still living"? Thirdly, the need for supplementary ministries is part of the need to express more adequately the priesthood of all believers and to give the laity their proper place in the Church. But above all stand two urgent needs—to ask the right questions and for someone to do something. We should be grateful to the lead from Southwell and Southwark, and to the Editor of this book and his eighteen contributors who show that the Church need never rely on a one-soldier army if only we can learn to deploy our man-power in new ways to meet the challenge of new opportunities.

✠ GEORGE WILLEDEN

SCRIPTURAL TONGUES

THE SACRED LANGUAGES. By PAUL AUVRAY, PIERRE POULAIN, and ALBERT BLAISE. Burns and Oates. 8s. 6d.

"FAITH and Fact Books" are a series, translated from the French, intended to survey modern knowledge from the Roman Catholic point of view. This particular book consists of essays written by three experts on the three sacred languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The purpose of the essays is to show the importance of a knowledge of these languages for a full understanding of the meaning of the Bible and, in the case of Greek and Latin, to show how Christianity took these languages and remoulded them in accordance with its needs. The essays on Greek and Latin, especially the latter, show complete command of their subject and should prove helpful to those intending to study the Versions or the Fathers. The essay on Hebrew cannot be so unreservedly recommended. It is disfigured with elementary errors. The Hebrew alphabet is given but contains two errors. The Heth is written as He and the medial Mem as Samekh. The first verse of Genesis is written out as an example of pointed Hebrew. This contains two wrong letters and one mistake in the pointing. Further the I.C.C. Commentary on Isaiah was written by G. B. Gray and not A. S. Peake as stated here.

J. ROBINSON

ROME OVER THE BORDER

THE ONE TRUE KIRK. By RONALD WALLS. Burns and Oates. 12s. 6d.

REMINISCENCES of school and College days, and of early days in the Presbyterian ministry, enable the writer to tell of his growing dissatisfaction with the Scottish Kirk and of his ultimate acceptance of the claims of the Church of Rome—The One True Kirk, as he calls it. Intimate sketches of life in a Highland parish reveal the difficulties encountered by him; and frequent hints, together with some conversational argument, leave the reader in no doubt about the trend of the author's mind from the start. He bears his readers along smoothly and certainly from the dourness, the forbidding rigour, and the hopeless ecclesiastical confusions of parishioners and ministerial neighbours to the invariable grace, and charm, and theological precision of those with whom he was clearly destined to make his home. "Where else", he asks, "could one go to find a body of clear, unchanging (*sic*) doctrine covering the whole field of human life?"

To Mr Wall's innocent surprise he found much preaching in the Roman Church. "However had we got the idea that the Church was a sermonless Church?" Let no Scot fear the loss of his cherished privilege of hearing sermons, should he be thinking of joining "The One True Kirk". But the success of this book in fulfilling the writer's obvious purpose of helping brother Scots to Rome will clearly depend upon

their ability to shed their well-known habit of "tasting sermons" before swallowing them.

As to English readers the publishers make the revealing suggestion that they will benefit by "the book's insight into what unites as well as to what separates them from their fellow Christians who this year celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the Scottish Reformation". This looks like a well-timed and doubtless well-meant warning against precipitate action in Anglican approaches to The Kirk. It may be said that it will take a far weightier book than this to delay for a single day the resumption of "conversations" not yet properly afoot.

OSCAR HARDMAN

MAN AND MORALS

WHAT PSYCHOLOGY SAYS ABOUT RELIGION. By WAYNE E. OATES. Hodder and Stoughton. 4s. 6d.

THE FUTURE OF MAN. The Reith Lectures, 1959. By P. B. MEDAWAR, F.R.S. Methuen. 10s. 6d.

PRUDENCE. By JOSEF PIEPER. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

WAYNE Oates is a well known writer in the much discussed field of psychology and religion. His present small volume is an excellent outline of the general conclusions about religious behaviour reached by a large number of psychologists, a number probably far larger than those who take a wholly critical attitude towards it. Yet it is not easy to see who will derive most benefit from reading it. In a small book it is impossible to give even a summary of the psychological reasons leading to these conclusions, so varied in their theories are the different schools. There is therefore little psychological content in it. Perhaps it will prove most useful in encouraging hesitating students to plunge more deeply into the question. It will also help those who have lost their way a little in the confusion of different theories to regain a healthy perspective of the whole field.

Professor Medawar's Reith Lectures have an equally salutary effect but in an opposite sense. He shows that many of the widely accepted biological theories on which we have been making forecasts about the future development of man, individually and in societies, have been shown to be at fault because based on inadequate evidence. In the last twenty years there has been a revolution in biology. He is content to deal with "the process of foretelling, rather than with what is actually foretold". It is, therefore, no use turning to the lectures in the hope of getting a scientifically validated picture of what the world will be like in a hundred years from now, or even in fifty years. Such predictions as Professor Medawar makes are very tentative. For instance: "I should not be in the least surprised if in the nineteen-seventies or nineteen-eighties we in Great Britain were to start exchanging uneasy glances

about the danger of over-population, and wondering where things were going to end." Again, he thinks that the general level of intelligence may be falling, but there is not enough evidence to prove or disprove the contention. But even if natural intelligence is falling away, the evolution of the brain puts within the capacity of man the ability to learn from experience and so, in some measure at least, to escape from the otherwise limiting effect of his genetic inheritance. This is not an easy book for the layman but one that all would-be social prophets should read with care.

Josef Pieper takes us back to Thomas Aquinas in his study of what the "angelic doctor" meant by Prudence when he placed it first among the cardinal virtues, the mother of the rest. It would be helpful to trace how the word came to deteriorate to its present "connotation of timorous, small-minded self-preservation, of a rather selfish concern about oneself", but we are not given this. Instead we are plunged straight into scholastic theology without apology or explanation. All that is needed is to understand what Aquinas meant! Granted that assumption, we have here a brilliant exposition of Prudence. Prudence is the knowledge of reality as it is and the ability to make right decisions. It is not concerned to discriminate what are the right ends of conduct, but with ways and means of translating ideals into action. It is thus a pre-condition of the other cardinal virtues, of justice, fortitude, and temperance.

Has this abstract theology any direct relevance to the problems of living, of attaining virtue? For the very few, perhaps it has. Most of us, however, find the path to Prudence encumbered with obstacles—no doubt of our own making—which can only be overcome by means to which Pieper here gives us no clue. He may have indicated what we are to aim at, but we lack the Prudence to gain Prudence. Religion is more than theology. But theologians will find him very interesting.

R. S. LEE

DIGEST OF ARCHAEOLOGY

AN INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY. By G. ERNEST WRIGHT.
Duckworth. 12s. 6d

THE work of Professor Wright on Biblical Archaeology is well-known and vies in excellence with similar volumes. All these abound in beautiful maps and lavish documentation. The book under review, however, is a poor man's guide; all luxuries are cut out and the original *Biblical Archaeology* is served up in the most condensed form imaginable. The result is that the reader seems to be turning the pages of another student's lecture notes. He is made to jump from subject to subject, from century to century, from the Patriarchs to the Church of

the first century. It is true, every chapter gives a brief hint regarding texts and illustrations in other books, but if these are not available the reader can do nothing, whereas if they are it is difficult to see why he should bother with this unreadable introduction. Reader's Digests may be a help in certain fields—Biblical Archaeology is not one of them.

U. E. SIMON

POPULAR APOLOGY

THE CHRISTIAN REPLIES. Edited by LESLIE DAVISON. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

REVIEWS seldom refer to such mundane considerations as size and price. *The Christian Replies* deserves to be an exception: it is exceptional value. And this might fairly be said of its content too.

It comprises, within the field of Christian apologetics, seventy-six questions and their answers. The questions are "genuine" and currently put—that is to say, they are not the questions which the theoretical apologist puts to himself in his study chair. The answers represent the common mind of a team which included Professors Coulson, Jessop, and Pawson, Gordon Rupp, Edwin Sangster, and a dozen other Methodist scholars. The material is grouped in seven sections; Religion; God; Christ; the Doctrines of Man, Sin, and Immortality; the Bible; the Church; and Prayer.

The book is addressed primarily (and very sensibly) to the thoughtful but ill-educated practising Christian, and only secondarily to the non-Christian—a clear instance of tackling the problem from the right direction and an important factor to be borne in mind by the reader who is himself an apologist and interested in "technique". For example, here and there, the answers seem to use the Scriptures overmuch. This is poor technique if the "opponent" is a genuine unbeliever. It is citing an authority for which he has no respect. But here, of course, the presumed "opponent" is not a complete unbeliever, and the citation of Scripture is useful.

It is within the experience of many that the questions put by the modern seeker are predominantly "philosophical" (when they are not merely factual). And in the light of this, the little section on "God" comprising eleven questions, is extremely useful. It gives *inter alia* a restatement of the cosmological, teleological, and ontological arguments which is masterly in its intelligibility.

The foregoing, however, is not intended to suggest that *The Christian Replies* is so good as to be above criticism. Every answer will evoke from theologian-readers an urge to improve. But this is inevitable and has no real bearing on the basic merit of the answers as they stand.

RICHARD TATLOCK

ENGLISH PIETY

THE KINGDOM WITHIN YOU. By GORDON HUELIN. Skeffington. 21s.

THIS IS an admirable study of English devotional writing. Dr Huelin has cast his net widely. Catholic and Protestant writers find themselves side by side, each making a profound and distinctive contribution to the common spiritual life. It must have been hard to choose twelve from the wealth of British mystical and ascetical writers. The choice was governed by the desire to make the selection truly representative and also by a wish that the books should be readily obtainable. *The Ancren Riwe* comes first: then a surprisingly varied medley—Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich, Thomas Cranmer, Lancelot Andrewes, George Herbert, John Bunyan, Jeremy Taylor, William Law, William Wilberforce, John Keble, and William Temple. The author was tempted to include Richard Rolle, Richard Baxter, and Evelyn Underhill. It would be idle to mention other obvious omissions. Rather let it be said that both choice and treatment are excellent. Perhaps the inclusion of Cranmer is a slight surprise, but so much of the Book of Common Prayer was his work that his influence on the life of Englishmen has been almost unique. Wilberforce again is not an obvious choice, but *A Practical View* is a fine fruit of Evangelical piety.

FREDERIC HOOD

CHRISTIAN HERO

JUNGLE PILOT. By RUSSELL T. HITT. Hodder and Stoughton. 16s.

IS IT true that romance and adventure have fallen out of overseas missionary work?

In the developing areas of the world, adventure is of a new sort, as formerly primitive peoples leap into the limelight of civilization, culture, and independence. But the impenetrable, danger-ridden forests of South America peopled by simple, superstitious tribes of Indians take us back to the era of Livingstone.

It was for work in this area that Nat Saint developed so remarkably the place of the aeroplane in meeting the needs of virtually marooned missionaries. This biography of an intrepid pilot, a skilled mechanic, and an imaginative, saintly missionary makes thrilling reading. To say that it would open wide the eyes of any teenager is not to limit its usefulness. This is a book for adventurous Christians of any age.

J. M. W. ADAM

THE REVOLUTION WITHIN

THEOLOGY OF CULTURE. By PAUL TILlich, edited by ROBERT C. KIMBALL. Oxford University Press, New York. 18s.

TO ME the highlight of this collection of writings of Paul Tillich on culture in relation to religion is his historical analysis and assessment of Existentialism, which is brilliant. Perhaps this is because Existentialism is near to his heart. That is why he describes it as a form of mysticism with more of the Protestant than the Catholic heritage in it. That is why, in rejecting "the Thomistic method of knowledge through sense perception and abstraction" as useful for scientific purposes but never able to reach the Absolute, Tillich adopts the ontological approach as penetrating beneath the cleavage between subject and object. Perhaps that is also the reason why he presents us here with the same unacceptably vague definition of religion as he has previously given elsewhere of faith, as "ultimate concern"—"You cannot reject religion with ultimate seriousness, because ultimate seriousness, or the state of being ultimately concerned, is itself religion."

In spite of his brilliance Tillich leaves me unconvinced and unenlightened because, as he says, "the Existentialist thinker needs special forms of expression" and frequently these do not make sense to me, so that a phrase like "an existentialist understanding of religion" seems to me to be a contradiction in terms. I cannot comprehend the Existentialist's "stratum of Being" which underlies the subject-object distinction, and I feel compelled to assume that I am one of the "defective and sub-human creatures" who are the "result of a tragic loss of personal Existence". Nevertheless I can appreciate that Existentialist writings, Christian or otherwise, "are the expression of the great revolution within and against Western industrial society which was prepared in the nineteenth century and is being carried out in the twentieth". The implications and consequences of this revolution, as suggested by Tillich, are both fascinating and provocative.

C. T. CHAPMAN

CHRISTIAN APOLOGIA

WHY CHRIST. By B. C. BUTLER. Darton, Longman and Todd. 10s. 6d.

EXCEPT for one chapter referred to below, *Why Christ* is a wholly acceptable apologia for the Christian Faith which a priest can profitably read for its intrinsic interest or as a basis for a series of instructions, or can recommend to an inquiring, friendly agnostic (whose minimum education will probably need to be at least "secondary-grammar").

The author begins with an able analysis of the situation in which modern man finds himself. Taking the medieval cultural synthesis as his starting point, he rapidly describes the determinants which have

contributed to the existing position: the Renaissance; Humanism; the Protestant Reformation; the Industrial Revolution; Biblical criticism; nineteenth-century scientific and philosophic attitudes, not least the myth of progress; and a widespread, if vague, materialism.

He then leads on to the assertion that to realize himself in such a situation man needs a vision. And the rest of the book is concerned to show that such a vision is provided most satisfyingly by the Christian Faith and that this Faith exhibits certain characteristics of which the principal is that it is necessarily institutional in its outward expression.

Inevitably, the weakest chapter is the sixth—on “Christ and the Church”. Here, the author, whose book is otherwise characterized by objectivity and patent candour, is committed to an apologia for the “Catholic” Church and the modern Roman papacy. In simple terms, he justifies the former on the surprisingly naïve notion that, being the biggest, it must be the best. As for the primacy of Peter, he makes a good case for this, but fails to find any convincing evidence that the transmission of this primacy to a long line of (predominantly) Italian clerics is part of the Divine plan. For want of a better argument he caps this particular discussion with the rhetorical question: “Can we not see . . . in the fact of the historical papacy the fulfilment of” a prophecy made by Christ? The hypothesis which lies behind this rhetoric is manifestly capable of some justification. Unhappily for the Abbot of Downside so is many another contradictory hypothesis.

In this chapter, too, the author represents the Eastern Churches and the Roman Church as basically boon-companions who for some unfathomable reason have “drifted out of communion”. This is less than candid, and is not the impression one receives from the Orthodox, and certainly not from the Armenians.

But it is unpleasant to be niggardly about an otherwise masterly book and about an author whose known scholarship is invariably characterized by charity. *Why Christ* is a good book.

RICHARD TATLOCK

HELPS FOR PREACHERS

THE OTHER SIX DAYS. By JOSEPH C. McLELLAND. Burns and MacEachern, Toronto, \$1.50.

THE DARK ROAD TO TRIUMPH. By CLAYTON E. WILLIAMS. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

A NEW MIND FOR A NEW AGE. By ALAN WALKER. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

REGULAR preachers need stimulus if their presentation is to remain fresh. No doubt the best help is from large books; but not all are ready to undertake such a discipline, and small ones have their part to play. Sometimes it is particularly refreshing to read books by writers

from other countries; and these three, by a Canadian, an American, and an Australian, may be found to have this added value.

The Other Six Days, by Dr J. C. McLelland of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, may not be available in this country. If so, this is unfortunate, as the book is a very useful examination of the Christian meaning of work and property, in the light of biblical teaching, the Fathers and the Reformers, and the conflicting doctrines of to-day. *The Dark Road to Triumph* is more obviously a book of sermons: they were preached in the Passion season in the American Church in Paris; and they are particularly valuable for the illustrative material they contain.

A New Mind for a New Age is by a much-travelled Australian Methodist. His gift is to contrast the world of to-day—with its man-made satellites, electronic machines able to do the work of 200 men, hydrogen bombs, and Afro-Asian nationalism, a world in which in the last twenty years fundamental medicine has learned as much as in the previous two hundred—with the world in which most religious teachers were brought up, whose patterns they, and their congregations, too readily take for granted. Stale ideas are proving impotent in a changed situation. But the Gospel is not a stale idea, but a faith and a power—a faith for the future.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

EYEWITNESS

WITH MY OWN EYES. By BO GIERTZ, translated by MAURICE MICHAEL. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

THE Bishop of Gothenburg has written a brave book. Unlike so many of the works of pious imagination which appeared between the wars his book burkes none of the issues. There is no concentration here on the gentler aspects of Jesus' life and ministry, the Lord in these pages is the Lord of life and death who truly dies and truly rises again and ascends into Heaven. The story ends on the day of Pentecost with the Apostles baptizing, absolving, and breaking bread.

The gospel narrative, which on the whole follows the Synoptists, is shown in a series of incidents recorded by eye-witnesses. Often St Peter purports to be the narrator. The Crucifixion is seen through the eyes of Simon of Cyrene and the penitent thief. Two of the resurrection appearances are described by Cleophas. The scenes throughout the book are lovingly and vividly set out with immense detail of description. The affect is almost that of a gallery of gospel pictures painted with all the jewelled concentration of the Pre-Raphaelites. To those who are helped by illustrations this book will be a treasure.

Yet, in the end, one is compelled to ask—is there something of deep theological significance in the reticence and anonymity of the four gospels with which we tamper at our peril? *With my own Eyes* is a

good book *about* our Lord, but we watch him at a remove, as we would watch the hero of any other story. Inevitably he loses in stature and we remain interested but uncommitted spectators.

SUSANNA HODSON

SOURCE BOOK

SOURCES OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. Volume II: SACRAMENTS AND FORGIVENESS. Edited with Commentary by PAUL F. PALMER, S.J. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press. London: Darton, Longman and Todd. 50s.

FR PALMER has followed up his earlier volume, which dealt with Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist, with a second one on Penance, Extreme Unction, and Indulgences; still further volumes are in prospect. The book consists of a remarkably copious collection of translated passages from primary sources, with introductory matter and notes. The compiler makes no secret of the fact that he writes from the standpoint of a modern Roman Catholic theologian, but his attitude is restrained and unprovocative. A useful appendix headed "Summary and Appraisal" gives an overall picture of the development which the assembled material illustrates.

E. L. MASCALL

FOUNDER OF S.S.M.

NO PIOUS PERSON. By HERBERT KELLY, S.S.M., edited by GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M. Faith Press. 15s.

THIS book consists of extracts from Fr Kelly's autobiographical and other writings, together with an introduction by the Reverend David M. Paton and some editorial notes by Bro. George Every, S.S.M.

It abounds in penetrating and original comments which reveal conviction, sincerity, and genuine humility, and at times are lightened by apt illustrations and impish fun. The chapters which are likely to arouse more general interest are those which give Fr Kelly's reflections (1) on the origin, development, and aims of the Society of the Sacred Mission and its Theological College, with the foundation of which his name is chiefly associated: (2) on his experience, contacts, and influence in the search for Christian Unity at the Camps of the Student Christian Movement and in the deliberations of the pioneers of the Ecumenical Movement; and (3) his reflections on his work in Japan as a teacher in the Anglican Theological College. Writing of that work, the Reverend D. M. Paton in his Introduction says: "He made an impression on the Anglican Church in Japan which is generally reckoned to be unique; and his influence is strong and powerful to this day."

That influence of Fr Kelly in these and other spheres was the consequence of a theological outlook on life which is evident throughout the whole book. In the early part of his autobiography he says that at Oxford he learnt two main things: (1) the width of God's world and of his interest therein, and (2) the habit of thinking. From those two lessons came his frequently expressed dislike of "pietism" and his refusal to have anything to do with the customary educational system of the Theological Colleges of the time, a system which he describes as "hopelessly at variance with theological principles" and against which he had to do battle later on in Japan. "I was seeking", he writes, "the infinite truth of the creeds as that which underlay life." And, "just as I had learnt to see how faith in God might be confused with the acceptance of doctrines, so I had learnt as an Evangelical to see how easily it could be confused with devotional feeling." "I want to know what Christ is doing in the street." "God and His Christ is concerned in man's daily work, in its efficiency, in its conduct, in one's relations with those around, the elevator man, the shoe-shine boy, in the relations between the manufacturer and his employees." "If we split life into religious sections, moral sections, business sections, it is plain God does not."

It is hoped we have indicated in this review that the book, in spite of the negative wording of its title, can be commended for the positive nature of its contents.

GEORGE BRANSON

THE WORLD RELIGIONS

THE WORLD'S LIVING RELIGIONS. By R. E. HUME. T. and T. Clark. 21s.

THIS book is a revision by Dr C. S. Braden of that first published in 1924 by the late Dr R. E. Hume, sometime professor of the history of religions in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. That it has been reprinted more than twenty-five times is itself a tribute to its popularity. This revision is a conservative one, but still leaves us with a useful introductory text-book.

The first and last chapters are perhaps the weakest part. The author has many wise comments to make and quotations to give on the study of religions, but at times his remarks border on the painfully obvious. Likewise the conclusion, comparing the living religions and attempting to reconcile them with a Harnackian type of Christianity is not strongly convincing.

The eleven great world faiths, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, and Christianity, are surveyed with particular reference to the teaching found in their sacred scriptures from which short representative selections are given. Generally the factual information is accurate; and a great merit of the book is its simplicity and orderliness. Dr Hume's value-judgements on the several religions must not, however,

be taken as always unquestionable. The editor himself makes a few modifications in his footnotes. Not the least helpful part of the book is its index and bibliography. It is essentially a preliminary source book. The reader must not expect from it any profound wrestling with the philosophical and theological problems arising from the comparative study of religions.

One cannot resist a comment on two curious features of the book as a literary production. At times the author's observations are almost painfully naïve; and his English style is generally awkward and colourless. These defects do not necessarily impair the helpfulness of the book to the sixth former or the first year student at college.

D. W. GUNDRY

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

THE MAKING OF THE CHURCH. By J. G. DAVIES. Skeffington. 21s.

IN A couple of hundred pages we are given an easily readable essay on the early growth of Christianity to the fourth Ecumenical Council. The period is stereotyped, but the treatment is not. Dr Davies has managed to look at the familiar landscape with fresh eyes.

While the growth and structure of the Church, its relations with the State and the development of its creed are given inevitable place, there are two whole chapters on its inner life and one on its social concerns. As an example of the style we can instance the account of the Bishop's duties: (1) to feed the flock (often physically as well as spiritually); (2) to offer the gifts (sacraments and preaching); (3) to forgive sins (including settlement of secular and civil cases); (4) to confer orders. It is not quite comprehensive enough but it does recognize spiritual interests as paramount.

W. W.

THE LORD'S DAY

THE DAY OF LIGHT. THE BIBLICAL AND LITURGICAL MEANING OF SUNDAY.
By H. B. PORTER. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

THIS very readable book about Sunday fills a notable gap in modern Christian literature, and fits well into the series of Studies in Ministry and Worship to which it is a contribution. Professor Porter, of Nashotah House, Wisconsin, distinguishes clearly the Jewish Sabbath from the Christian Sunday, and traces the confusion which has arisen between them to the literal use of the Old Testament in the Middle Ages, of which one consequence was that Sabbath regulations were increasingly applied to Sunday. He gives an account in positive terms of what Sunday ought to mean to the Christian by reference to what the primitive Church did on Sunday. The New Testament reveals that

they worshipped, heard sermons, received the sacraments, and gave alms: Justin's account of Sunday mentions precisely the same activities. Yet to-day, though we may still do the same things on Sunday, "they have lost their theological connection with Sunday and with each other". The theological connection arises from the associations of the first day of the week with the creation of light, the resurrection, and the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit, which are most interestingly and usefully traced.

It is fair to dwell on the merits of this book rather than its sometimes exaggerated generalizations, and the evidence that in some points Professor Porter's studies have not fully covered his ground. His enthusiasm for the festival of Sunday and his enlightening exposition of its meaning outweigh the lesser faults. We gladly accept his approach to Sunday as a "symbol of the fundamental realities of the Christian gospel": though we may think that he goes too far when he speaks of Sunday as an essential part of the Christian revelation, on an equal level with the sacraments and as indispensable.

E. C. WHITAKER

CROSS-ROADS

PROTESTANTISM. By GEORGE H. TAVARD. Burns and Oates. 8s. 6d.

THE series called "Faith and Fact Books", with the sub-title "Catholic Truth in the Scientific Age", is a useful one, each volume being well produced and a good money's worth. Here is No. 137. The author is a French Augustinian. The translation by Rachel Attwater is so good that the reader has the impression that the original language was English. The bibliography includes works by Bishops Wand and Neill and by J. S. Whale, and Fr Tavard has done his utmost to be fair, objective, and even appreciative. The profound spirituality of the Protestant mind is found to be much closer to Roman Catholicism than it realizes. Modern Protestantism presents a curious mixture of liberalism and neo-orthodoxy in varying proportions. It is interesting to speculate on the theology which may emerge from this *melée*. One chapter is entitled *The Anglican Crossroads*. Two main driving forces are here seen. In theological distinction Anglo-Catholicism wins unopposed: in the sphere of reunion Low Churchmen lead. The Anglican Communion is a cross-roads of all the theologies of the Christian world. So far from condemning it for this reason, the genial author remarks that cross-roads are meeting places where strangers may become friends.

FREDERIC HOOD

BIBLICAL ANTHOLOGY

THE ESSENTIAL BIBLE. By JOSEPH McCULLOCH. Hutchinson. 25s.

HERE is the book for which some of us have been hoping. It is an introduction to the whole Bible, and yet, if the reader gets no further, the essentials are here. The unity of the Scriptures and the theme of the atonement in Christ are brought before the reader with a new clarity.

The production of the book is admirable, and the Authorized Version is used throughout.

This book is not just another book about the Bible, but the Bible itself set forth in a gripping and enthralling unity, and in such a way that the ordinary reader can see the wood for the trees.

J. F. D. TRIMINGHAM

A MISNOMER

SIGNIFICANT CHURCH HISTORY. By R. GORDON MILBURN. James Clarke. 7s. 6d.

BOTH the title and the opening paragraph of this small book are misleading. Even those sympathetic towards Mr Milburn's view-point would hardly describe his reflections as "significant church history"; and can seventy short pages really contain a serious consideration of the successive phases of the impact of modern thought upon the Church during the period since 1860?

It would be truer to describe the book as setting forth the author's reasons for his inability, as he tells us, to hold any regular position in the ministry for over forty years.

There are many generalizations, some of so sweeping a nature as the statement that "every sermon preached now requires a glossary of terms, for all have become ambiguous".

To Anglicans who are already conscious of the unsuitability of certain of their Church's services for modern needs, Mr Milburn's suggested draft—including a sermon "in the form of a lecture of, let us say, forty minutes"!—will scarcely seem the ideal solution.

On the other hand, his proposal that the whole of church history and doctrine between A.D. 200 and 1800 should be reserved for specialists and omitted from the training of parochial clergy, will doubtless appeal to many harassed theological students.

GORDON HUELIN

THE ROMAN QUESTION

THE CHURCH OF ROME. A DISSUASIVE. By R. P. C. HANSON and R. H. FULLER. S.C.M. 6s.

THIS is a revised and cheap edition of a book which was first published in 1948. Its aim is to present a dissuasive to any who may be rather enviously looking over the fence at their neighbour's garden; and the advice it offers takes the form of "a fair examination of the claims and credentials of the Roman Catholic Church". Without a trace of Protestant bias or of insular smugness the authors have produced a scholarly work, in the brief compass of 160 pages, fair in its ungrudging recognition of the good things still to be seen in the Church of Rome, fair also in its exposure of the errors which invalidate Rome's teaching and in its strong condemnation of the "lust of power" which bears Rome relentlessly on its course.

The list of contents may suggest to some who scan it a rather discursive examination of Rome's more vulnerable points. But as the reader proceeds, he will find a definite pattern of sound argument against the fundamentals of Rome's position, together with an abundance of precise and telling illustration. "Tradition", doctrinal "development", the crowning folly of "infallibility"—these and other matters are discussed with such clarity as to evoke the gratitude of any reader who is honestly seeking to be helped to the truth, in this matter which has once again assumed an urgent and vital importance.

OSCAR HARDMAN

WOMEN PRIESTS

WOMEN AND THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE CHURCH. By E. L. MASCALL. Church Literature Association. 3s.

THIS important pamphlet was written at the request of the Theological Committee of the Church Union to assist theological thought on the question of the possibility of women receiving the sacrament of Holy Orders. Until comparatively lately, this question had not been seriously argued, for the impossibility of women being ordained was taken for granted. St Thomas Aquinas dismisses the question in a very summary fashion, and succeeding centuries were content to act on his authority.

But this question has received a fresh urgency as the result of the Church of Sweden ordaining three women priests. Further, with the reunion schemes of various denominations being mooted where women ministers are allowed, this question assumes a further importance, for in those denominations women ministers are accepted on an equality with male ministers. The women ministers would therefore have to be unified with the same service as the male ministers would be unified, in the combined Ministry of the Uniting Churches. This would, in

Anglican thought which holds the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, mean the bestowal of Holy Orders.

The importance of Dr Mascall's pamphlet is that he argues the question both theologically and practically. There is also an important note by Dr E. O. James who approaches the question from the point of view of an anthropologist.

In a short notice it is impossible to do justice to Dr Mascall's argument, for it is composed of many strands and it is only when each strand is entwined with others that justice can be done to his argument and his case properly considered. He has read widely on the subject, and quotes from all the literature on it. He recognizes that it may not be possible to assert absolutely that it is impossible for a woman to receive Holy Orders, but it is equally impossible to assert that she can. Theologically, it would seem that priesthood is a male activity, for our Lord, the One Priest, was Man. But this is the crux of the argument. The Catholic believes in priesthood, but Dr Paul Tillich writes that "Protestantism demands a radical laicism". Here is the supreme difference. The Catholic thinks of a priest standing at the altar representing our Lord's Sacrifice. The Protestant thinks of the minister standing in the pulpit declaring the salvation procured for us by our Lord.

This is one of the great controversies of our day. No one should attempt to have an opinion on this subject until he has read Dr Mascall's pamphlet.

The writer of this notice is inclined to depreciate, even more than Dr Mascall, parts of Dr N. P. Williams' massive speech in the Convocation of Canterbury in 1938, for he is of the opinion that in the case of neurotic women sex has already entered the Sanctuary. There is no bibliography, but the references given in the footnotes supply this need.

F. E. P. S. LANGTON

ANGLICAN FAILURE?

THE POLITICS OF ENGLISH DISSENT. By RAYMOND G. COWHERD. Epworth Press. 21s.

ANGLICANS who engage in inter-Church discussions are sometimes irritated by the prejudice and suspicions of Free Churchmen. Professor Cowherd's book does much to explain and justify suspicions.

In his scholarly analysis of the religious aspects of liberal and humanitarian reform movements from 1814 to 1848 he shows how progress was blocked time and again by the Established Church. It is a sorry tale.

An aristocratic society was feeling its way towards democracy, and the Dissenters provided the inspiration that quickened the advance and

the restraint that spared the country from violent upheavals that happened elsewhere.

The Methodists were not advocates of democracy as such, but they eagerly supported particular causes—the abolition of slavery, the Factory Acts, the broadening of the parliamentary franchise, and prison reform; and they managed to win the loyalty of the rising middle classes for these ends. In fact to the Dissenters and to the despised Evangelical wing of the Church goes the credit for orderly advance. It was a long struggle, but insistence on moral principles coupled with careful organization and tenacity led to victory.

But the Established Church, which had a golden opportunity to lead the crusade for social righteousness, was too much wedded to an aristocratic outlook, with the result that it alienated the new middle and industrial classes. On nearly every important issue the bishops were among the opponents of reform.

At a time when only one child in sixteen had the chance to go to school the hierarchy considered Anglican prerogatives to be more important than educational needs. When there were mass demonstrations against slavery the episcopate refused to participate. When the Reform Bill went to the House of Lords the Primate denounced it as “mischievous in its tendency and extremely dangerous to the fabric of the constitution”, and only one bishop had the courage to vote for it. And the Jewish relief bill, which passed through the Commons, was rejected by the Lords with twenty bishops voting against, and only three in favour. Nor did the episcopal bench do better when it came to admitting dissenters to the universities, twenty-two being in favour of excluding them, and two for removing the ban.

Professor Cowherd writes without passion or bitterness; but by keeping to facts and statistics he proves that although Christian principle played a big part in the democratic development of Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Established Church did little to help and much to hinder. Of course individual Churchmen identified themselves with the humanitarian efforts of the Dissenters, and in some instances played a leading rôle, but they rarely had the support of the episcopate.

Professor Cowherd's book is valuable in that it demonstrates the positive contribution of Free Churchmen; it also helps the reader to understand why the industrial classes are estranged from the Established Church.

✠ MERVYN STOCKWOOD

WHAT IS MAN?

MAN AND PEOPLE. By JOSE ORTEGA Y GASSET. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

THIS is a tantalizing book. It is the third of Ortega y Gasset's works to be published in English, following his much-praised indictment of contemporary society, *The Revolt of the Masses*, and the review of

history from a Christian slant, *Man and Crisis*. Consisting of the substance of lectures delivered in various Institutes, it was intended to be Part 1 of a critique of contemporary sociology. Unfortunately, Ortega's death prevented the publication of the second half and leaves this one, like the bridge of Avignon, starting with conviction and ending with abruptness. Ortega insists that any valid sociology must start, not with the observed behaviour of groups, but from the present experience of the individual.

Man is to him not, primarily, a *thinker*. (In fact, he can exist with very little positive cerebration at all.) Man is a doer, and a chooser—most literally, a pragmatist. This very soon involves him in dealings with the “other”, and this other, because of his powers of choice and action, is at least a potential enemy. Things—and to a larger degree, animals—are collaborators with us in living because we can foresee and so in a sense control their reactions. But man is capable of unforeseen and so dangerous activity—and much of history is simply a statement of this fact, in opposition to the wish-fulfilment of the starry-eyed sociologist. Now all environment, whether in terms of things or of persons, is simultaneously present with us at two distances, or on two levels.

There is that which is an immediate contact and there is that of whose existence we are aware, but whose significance to us at the moment is negligible. This means that we have two sorts of behaviour—our pragmatic activity, and what Ortega calls a “usage”, a conventional pattern of behaviour when the self is not really engaged. This pattern of behaviour is accepted without thought, and often changed without criticism.

It is at this point that the book breaks off—leaving the reader sometimes puzzled, occasionally exhausted, but most often stimulated—if only by Ortega's delight in words as such and the quickness of his original mind.

He is, in fact, in the great tradition of Europeans—of those who delight in ideas and in the hunting of them to their end.

STEPHAN HOPKINSON

PRAYERS FOR HEALTH

PRAYERS FOR CHRISTIAN HEALING. Compiled by ALBERT E. CAMPION.
Mowbrays. 8s. 6d.

THE compiler of this book has done a great service in producing this volume, which helps to fill an urgent need. He has cast his net very wide and it is not surprising that he has gathered together both bad and good; but that does not detract from a fine piece of work. Many of the prayers are suitable for use in public worship, while others have their place in private. Common honesty compels the admission that some are best forgotten.

On the whole, there is too much emphasis on bodily healing (nearly always stated first) but it is refreshing and valuable to note the emphasis on "wholeness" in a prayer written by an eminent psychiatrist who is a member of the Society of Friends. Some prayers draw forth the judgement, "This man *knows*", either because of his own suffering or because his insight does not fail him—or us. The latter point is illustrated by a fine prayer written by the chaplain of a mental hospital, for there is mention, not only of the need for understanding on the part of those who live with the mentally sick, but also of the shame that some of the relatives feel. And he does not forget those who laugh as a sop to their own fears. One prayer mentions "good nursing", which is quite different from "nursing"; another recognizes that the hallowing of pain is only brought about by triumphing over it. Prayer comes from the depths of our experience and shows, in a fascinating way, our psychological make-up. The book, quite apart from its obvious usefulness, will amply re-pay careful study with this point in mind. Some of the contributions are positive, polished and to the point; some are tinged with a near hysteria; some show a true integration. How I would like to meet and learn from Thomas Fuller!

The Bishop of Lichfield, Chairman of the Churches' Council of Healing, writes an appreciative and richly deserved foreword.

NORMAN SMALL

THEOLOGICAL SERMONS

WE ARE THE PHARISEES. By E. C. HOSKYNs. S.P.C.K. 5s. 6d.

THIS book, with an excellent introduction by F. N. Davey, gives us two valuable courses of sermons, delivered more than twenty-five years ago in the Chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was Dean, on the relevance of the Bible and the duty of churchpeople ("We are the Pharisees") not merely "to sit in Moses' seat", and to know the law, but also to do it.

The first course on Judaism in the time of Christ faces grave issues with a deep insight into human nature—studies in people or groups of people connected with Christ in his passion. The second course, on Bible Study, shows the effect of modern criticism and scholarship in attesting the essential worth of the Bible, and tries to present a point of view which regards the Bible as of absolute value without the dangers of fanaticism. But the analogy of the "scandal of the Bible", and a catastrophic theory of creation as against "an easy, smooth doctrine of evolution" is unfortunate, for no known theory of evolution is either easy or smooth.

Although Sir Edwyn did not live to revise these sermons, they are finely written in clear and weighty prose. There is wit and pungency, and masterly conciseness which enables so much to be said in so short

a space. There is material here for many sermons, and the course on the Bible would be admirable as a basis for group discussion.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

CONTEMPORARY PULPIT

WESTMINSTER SERMONS. Volume One: At Morning Worship. By W. E. SANGSTER. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

IN THE MIDST OF THE THRONE. By MALDWYN EDWARDS. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

KNOW YOUR FAITH. By NELS FERRE. Epworth Press. 8s. 6d.

IT HAS been observed by Dr Vidler that one consequence of the 1914-18 war was that the mighty stream of published sermons suddenly dwindled to the merest trickle. Is the stream returning? Here, at any rate, are three volumes of sermon material, all from the same Methodist publishing house. Each in its different way is worthy of attention.

The late W. E. Sangster was an individual and probably inimitable preacher. Yet though his personal style is not to be copied there is much to be learned about sermon construction from this collection—chosen by himself on a sick bed. Particularly skilful are the contrasts built up from Scriptural texts; as in "Four Judgements on Jesus" (John 10. 20, 7. 12, Matt. 16. 16, John 20. 28) or "Three Groans" (Rom. 8 22, 23, 26). The sermons were chosen because they were well known to have helped individual hearers. They may help many more.

Dr Maldwyn Edwards' style is far less staccato. He is quietly persuasive; and he is rich in illustration. He follows the Christian Year—with such additions as Temperance Sunday and Sunday School Anniversary. Whereas some of his sermons have been preached in America and Australia, the third volume under review is by an American, containing the substance of sermons and addresses given in Britain. Dr Nels Ferré has an epigrammatic style which he uses in grappling with fundamental questions. "The Christian faith", he can say, "is authoritative, but never authoritarian." "Authority does not lie in experience, but comes through experience." "The Church is the building for which the Bible offers the blueprint."

The strength of the first volume is that it is based on Scripture, of the second that it follows the Christian Year, and of the third that it is doctrinal. Sermons of this quality we need to hear—and perhaps to read.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

NOTE: The title of the book by E. G. Loosley, published by the Religious Education Press, and reviewed in our last issue (p. 116) should have been given as THE GOSPEL OF ST MARK.